Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BR936 .C773
Cooke, Richard J. (Richard JosephMAIN
Religion in Russia under the Soviets / b
3 9967 00092 2992

ACCESSION NUMBER 54155

SHELF NUMBER BR 936 C773

The Virginia Library

McCormick
Theological Seminary

of the

Presbyterian Church, Chicago

826 Belden Avenue

From

Received Sept. 1924

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-ABI-391

OTHER BOOKS BY BISHOP COOKE

THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE.

HISTORY OF THE RITUAL OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, WITH A COMMENTARY ON ITS OFFICES.

THE INCARNATION AND RECENT CRITICISM.

JUDICIAL DECISIONS OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

THE WINGLESS HOUR.

THE CHURCH AND WORLD PEACE.

RELIGION IN RUSSIA UNDER THE SOVIETS

BY
RICHARD Joseph COOKE
One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church

McCORMICK
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY.

THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK CINCINNATI

Copyright, 1924, by
RICHARD J. COOKE

All rights reserved, including that of translation into foreign languages, including the Scandinavian

Printed in the United States of America

C713

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	PREFACE	7
I.	BACKGROUND	17
II.	ATTACK	60
III.	T'CHEKA	96
IV.	TERROR	123
V.	CONCLAVE	156
VI.	SOVIET CHURCH	195
VII.	TIKHON	218
VIII.	OPINIONS	245
IX.	FUTURE	267
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	303
	INDEX	307

PREFACE

THE following pages present in briefest manner an epitome of the principal events in the Orthodox Church of Russia from the year 1917 to the present time. Having some knowledge of the difficulties which confront one who would be bold enough to undertake at this time a complete and detailed history, I have not attempted the impossible. What has been attempted is to put together in some sort of connected whole and in their proper perspective or relation, the scattered fragments of authentic information after critical sifting of much that has appeared in the public press and in many volumes. This itself, the sifting of the true from the false, is a formidable undertaking. An epidemic of misrepresentation, like one of those dreadful plagues which in times past corrupted the soil and poisoned the air and created such fear of contagion that cities and towns were emptied of their populations, seems to have become, since the War of the Nations, almost universal. The wells have been poisoned. To such degree of perfection has the fine art of diplomatic invention been developed that even

when the truth is presented it is viewed with suspicion and men are confused in their judgments, unable to distinguish clearly between the true and the false, they look so much alike.

The dominant ideas or character of an age may be inferred from the new words which appear in its language. "Propaganda," a sinister term, belongs solely to the vocabulary of the present. It reveals the struggle between truth and falsehood, each endeavoring to supplant the other. Here is a pamphlet of nearly one hundred pages entitled *Facts and Fabrications About Soviet Russia.* It is a list of newspapers and magazines published in the United States containing citations from editors, from published speeches and statements of public men, eminent political government officers, leaders in commerce, labor, foreign correspondents of the daily press, exposing the failures, the crimes, and revolutionary programs of the Bolsheviks. In opposition to this collection of anti-Soviet literature is another list of papers and magazines proclaiming the virtuous aims of Bolshevism, refuting the charges and holding up to condemnation the misrepresentations of the Antis. "And Pilate said unto him, What is truth? And he went out." Went out from the only One who could tell him.

One paper, an English organ of repute, the Manchester Guardian, declared, on the authority of a Bolshevik official, M. Litvinov, that "during the whole reign of terror only 400 persons were executed, more than half of whom were criminals." But the Novaia Zhin, quoted by a well-known Russian writer, I. V. Shklovsky, states that at the close of 1917 a Saint Bartholomew massacre took place in Sevastopol during which five hundred citizens disappeared. The Revolutionary garrison decided to kill all the bourgeoisie. "They massacred the inhabitants of the two most bourgeoisie streets in Sevastopol, then the same operation was extended to Simferopol, and then it was the turn of Eupatoria." The official organs of the Bolsheviks reported the shooting of bankers, manufacturers, Constitutional-Democrats, priests, army officers. The Izvestia of October 6, 1918, reported the execution of one hundred and seventy-two in two small towns. The same official organ contains a report of the Conference of the Extraordinary Commission. "Comrade Boki gave the details of the work of the Petrograd Commission. . . . Total number of persons arrested, six thousand, two hundred and twenty. *Eight hundred were shot.*"—And yet the Manchester Guardian gives the total num-

ber of executions under the Bolsheviks as four hundred.

One writer, extolling the efforts of the Soviets to destroy illiteracy and popularize culture, says, "No fair-minded man can deny that the Communists have shown great ardor in carrying knowledge and culture to the people." But another writer, Professor M. I. Rostovtsev, professor in the University of Petrograd, Fellow of the Academy of Sciences of Russia, Hon. D. Litt. Oxford, Corresponding Member of the British Academy, showing what kind of culture is brought to the people, the failure of the schools and the ignorance of the teachers employed, says, "None of the Bolshevist institutions have proved capable of living. The Bolsheviks created a new Socialistic Academy, in the hope of replacing the old one by it, but they have still to keep the old one going, as the new Academy proved useless. It cannot, of course, execute any scientific work; there are no scientists and learned men in it. . . . People hoped that it would be an instructional institution, but what it all came to is shown by the following letter from the students of the Socialistic Academy, published in the Izvestia of February 20, 1919 (I cannot guarantee the correctness of the quotation):

"'The Socialistic Academy is undergoing a serious crisis. Although there are lecturers and inspectors, the number of students is falling more and more, and the lectures take place only on paper. The life of the Academy as an instructional institution is reduced to zero.' This is not to be wondered at when it is remembered that the Academical staff consists of totally ignorant and half-ignorant men."

Concerning secondary schools a former head teacher in Russia states in a translated article in the Contemporary Review, December, 1923:

> The last important change was the reintroduction of school fees, which were made far higher than they had been in pre-Bolshevik days.
>
> As a result of all these reforms, the number of secondary schools in Russia has decreased by fifty per cent (according to data collected by N. Sorokin from official sources), and those that still remain lead a precarious existence; the children have lost the habit of working steadily and with concentration, and there has been a terrible waste of vital energy both on the part of the pupils and of the teachers.

Out of such contradictions what critical skill can extract the truth? Nor has the religious press in every instance any stronger claim to reliability than the secular press. Here also interpretation of facts, even if correctly stated, is as deeply colored by prejudice and personal

interests as among the daily papers, which are accused by some religious editors of distorting facts and perverting truth according to the demands of special interests and the business office.

In order to prove that the Bolsheviks are more benefactors than malefactors, that the seizure of church treasures was exaggerated by the daily press, one editor prints a picture of the interior of a church in which are seen the silver candlesticks, ikons, and the ornaments of the altar, proof positive of the editor's contention. But off-setting this is the Bolsheviks' own official report that the value of church treasures seized runs up into millions of dollars.

Then another religious paper for the information of its readers discounts the reports of outrages against religion. But this again is neutralized by an eyewitness, a British chaplain at Odessa, in the London Times of December, 1919. Reporting conditions in Odessa, he states:

> It was the martyrdom of the two Metropolitans and the assassination of so many bishops and the killing of hundreds of various Christian ministers of religion, regardless of denomination or school of thought, that proved the undoing of the *Scourge*. Russian Orthodox clergy, Protestant Lutheran pastors, Roman Catholic priests, were tortured and done to death with the same

light-hearted indiscrimination in the name of Toleration and Freedom. Then it was that the *Scourge*, seeing the last remnants of Liberty ground under the heel of a tyranny more brutal in its methods than a mediæval torture chamber, published another full-page cartoon representing Moses descending from the Burning Mount bringing in his arms the Tables of the Ten Commandments to Humanity and being stoned to death by a mob of workmen's and soldiers' delegates.

The following Sunday afternoon I was passing through the Town Gardens, when I saw a group of Bolshevist soldiers insulting an ikon of the thorn-crowned face of Christ. The owner of the ikon was spitting in the pictured face, while the others were standing round watching with loud guffaws of laughter. Presently they tore the sacred picture into fragments, danced on it, and trampled and stamped the pieces into the mud.

This testimony is in line with the statement of a member of the House of Representatives, who declared in Congress (see Congress. Record, January 11, 1924, p. 860): "Prior to my arrival in Petrograd the figures of Christ and a capitalist in effigy were dragged through the streets."

Volumes of such statements and counter-statements could be presented. The task before me, then, was not to write detailed history, which cannot be done now, but to compare statements, to sift documents, and by established principles of analytical criticism to discover the truth, if possible, and to state it

without prejudice. The impelling motive actuating the labor, long and wearisome, was solely that those who are interested in the welfare of Christ's kingdom among the nations might have some clear conception of the conflict between atheism and religion in Russia, and thereby dissipate much of the misunderstanding in the churches about many important questions.

If those who under any guise defend Bolshevism while indignantly denying doing so, which is a very common method among Soviet apologists, should insist that what is here written is a partial statement and a biased judgment, my reply is, I have made no partisan appeal or misstatement of fact. The documents inserted in the text tell their own story. As to bias in judgment, I may be faulty, for no one is infallible, but I am not wholly without judicial fairness nor a sense of moral responsibility. I am biased, however, in favor of God and against irreligion. But this does not mean that one should defend everything that may be called religion and condemn indiscriminately every act against it, or be willfully blind to the weaknesses, the sins, and the failures of the church.

The sources of information are various and numerous. The results of correspondence

and details of personal interviews are not given, nor are certain documents which if traced back to original source might endanger personal interests abroad, but documents and translations from Soviet official organs, which are the chief authorities relied upon as less liable to dispute, are inserted in order that the reader may judge for himself the validity of the declarations from the facts with the authentic data before him.

Works in the English language dealing specifically with the subject compared with the multitudinous volumes on the political, economic, and social affairs in Russia, are very few. For a general view, Rambaud's and Karasmin's *Histories of Russia,* English translation, and *The Russian Church and Russian Dissent,* Harpers, 1857, the best work in English on the subject by Alfred F. Heard, formerly Consul-General for Russia at Shanghai, will be found of great value. But the Bibliography of works relating to this particular subject at the close of this volume may be helpful to those desirous of further study. Hearty thanks, therefore, are due to those who have assisted me with books and papers in the preparation of this volume, small as it is, and as imperfect as I well know it to be, owing to the difficulty

of obtaining facts and correctly appraising them.

In a special manner I wish to acknowledge the courtesy of The Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., and the publishers of Current History and of the Atlantic Monthly for permission to use certain items not otherwise obtainable.

R. J. C.

MCCORMICK
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY.

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

The intelligent inquirer who would know the causes of things political, as well as the Christian student interested in the affairs of God's kingdom, may well inquire what brought about the present calamity upon the Church in Russia. What were the causal factors which, working through long periods of time, finally reduced the Holy Orthodox Church of Russia to its present deplorable condition? The Church of France survived the Revolution and leaped into renewed life and influence. The Church of England withstood the attacks of the Cromwellian period, and though almost a minority in the land still stands among the bulwarks of Christendom against the destructive forces of unbelief and disorder. But, the Church in Russia, yesterday a national institution of power, possessing great wealth, of far-spread influence among all races and tongues in the empire, and claiming the reverential allegiance of eighty-five millions of adherents, is reduced to a state of humiliation and poverty, persecuted by the gov-

ernment, her priests condemned, her teachings scorned, her churches confiscated, her activities restricted, her God outlawed.

It will not be so always. The Church in Russia is still vigorous within its limitations, and if it will profit by its experience, it may yet accomplish a greater deed than ever in her history. But such questions are at the front in Christian thought. They are of interest to everyone who considers from any viewpoint the future of Russia. It is not the first time such a calamity has occurred, and, since like causes produce like effect, it may not be the last, if the lesson of the past and of the present, that the Church in every country exists for the people, and not the people for the sake of the Church, shall pass unheeded by ultraconservatives in Church or in state. Radicalism is not to be greatly feared. Usually it corrects itself. Growing by what it feeds on and becoming more radical to satisfy increasing radicalism, it runs counter sooner or later to the self-preservative instincts of men by destroying what they have built, and thus destroys itself. But narrow-minded conservatism kills in people the spirit of growth, which life resents, for life must expand or die, and such conservatism can be cured only by the strong medicine of revolution.

The beginnings of Christianity in Russia, as in some other countries, such as Spain and Britain, are embedded in legend. The activities of holy men, pioneers of the kingdom of God and unconscious builders of civilization in that vast territory which before the World War covered eight million one hundred thousand square miles, or nearly one sixth of the entire globe, are so interwoven with marvelous interpositions of Providence, miracles, martyrdoms, and extraordinary events that, while some kernel of truth may be found at the base of such narratives, it soon becomes evident that here, as elsewhere in stories of origins, where history is lacking, fancy invents.

It does not follow, however, that such legends are wholly useless. There may be much fiction in the annals of early Rome, but they have served to instruct and will continue to inspire enthusiasm for those hardy virtues which make people great. The legends of the leaders, the saints and martyrs of early Christianity in its struggle against heathenism, once did similar service. They may be now passed over with a compassionate remark or complacent smile as the product of religious frenzy or poetic imagination, but to the historical inquirer they picture the manners and customs, the faith, the heroism of those Chris-

tians who laid in barbarous times the foundations of Christianity among those peoples who have since become the masters of the world.

Originally, the Russians, who founded the states of Kiev and Novgorod, were a fierce, rough-hewn race. Ignorant and brutal, they were nevertheless unconquerable in their love of freedom and have shown themselves capable of the highest intellectual development. In government they recognized no regular authority. Ancient custom, and the councils of the aged in whom reposed the wisdom of former times, served them as laws. In their warlike expeditions they elected their own chiefs, and when the expedition was over each returned to his own home.

In 862 A. D. disorder and general anarchy impelled those who lived in the districts around Novgorod and Moscow to invite the Russians on the other side of the Baltic to rule over them. The invitation was accepted. Three brothers, Rurick, Sincori, and Trouver, passed over and established their seats of government. Sincori and Trouver died within two years, and Rurick became the sole ruler of these provinces, which later embraced the whole of Central Russia.

From the remotest period religion was a passion, and the more mysterious its symbol-

ism the more it appealed to their introspective nature. They worshiped Peroun, the God of Thunder, and peopled the hills, the rivers, and forests with genii, by whose aid they sought to penetrate the secrets of the future. Above all gods they worshiped a supreme God whose dwelling was among the stars in the immensities of the universe. He was the good God, the "White God." His opposite was the "Black God," the spirit of Evil.

To the missionary labors of the Greek Church must be ascribed the conversion of the Russians. In a circular letter to the Eastern Bishops, Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, 866 A. D., refers to the conversion of the Russians from paganism and states that he had sent them bishops and priests. Prior to this date, however, the Greek Church had sent the missionaries Cyril and his brother Methodius to contiguous tribes, among whom they labored for many years. They invented an alphabet, the Slavonic, translated the Scriptures and the Greek Liturgy, held services according to the Greek form, and by their apostolic lives won over those fierce races to the gospel of Jesus Christ. Other agencies also contributed to the knowledge of Christianity. Hardy traders who risked their cargoes and their lives on the waters of the

Dnieper and the Black Sea, traveling between the interior and Constantinople, would return to relate in their villages the wonders they had seen in the capital of the Eastern Empire, and something of that strange religion whose ceremonies overawed their spirits and appealed to their imagination.

In 955 A. D. Queen Helga, wife of Igur, the ruler of Kiev, journeyed to Constantinople in search of the true God, and was baptized, receiving the name Helen, in memory of the mother of Constantine. Her attempts to convert her people on her return met with little success, but her memory became a determining factor in the conversion of her grandson, Vladimir the Great. The chronicles of those times relate that, persuaded by certain Greek Christians, Vladimir sent an embassy to Constantinople to inquire into the religion practiced there, the religion of his grandmother, which had arrested his thought and demanded his obedience.

The embassy was received with the greatest honors by the Imperial Court, long accustomed to elaborate ceremonial and desirous of impressing the ambassadors intrusted with such an important mission.

Constantinople, the capital of the Byzantine Empire, was the center of the Oriental Greek

Church. The ancient Patriarchates of Jerusalem, of Antioch, of Alexandria, still existed, but the swift progress of Islam, like a sirocco blast from the desert, spreading its black wings over North Africa, Egypt, and Asia Minor, had well-nigh destroyed Christianity in the lands of its birth. The Churches of Anatolia held precarious existence at the mercy of the Sultan. The Koran had supplanted the gospel, and the voice of the muézzin calling the Mohammedan faithful to prayer was more efficacious than the ineffectual preaching of the successors of the apostles. Doctrinal discussions, heresies, feuds, had done their work. The Churches, weakened by martyrdoms, controversies, and relapses from the faith, fell easy prey to the green banner of Mohammed.

But the hosts of Islam had not yet reached the gates of Constantinople. Here, Christianity, though obscured by novelties unknown to the early Church, superstitions and worthless tradition, found its most impressive expression. The creeds of Nicea and Chalcedon in which were crystallized the belief of earlier days, the Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils defining the faith and the government of the Church were taught by learned theologians. Here were treasured the memories of Chrysos-

tom, Gregory the Theologian, John the Healer, and the great Photius, who defended the Eastern Church against papal Rome. The worship of God in the great Church of the Holy Wisdom, Saint Sophia, with its inspiring, if tedious, ritual, lifted the soul to heights of spiritual fervor.

This marvelous temple, surpassing in richness of adornment, in height and length the Temple of Solomon, exclusive of its porches, had been built by the Emperor Justinian at a cost of over five millions of dollars and the labor of ten thousand workmen. The temples of nearly all the ancient gods in the empire were robbed of their material to add grandeur to its appearance. Baalbec, Ephesus, Delos, Athens, Cyzicus furnished gigantic columns; precious marbles, variegated in color, were brought from distant quarries. Mosaics of Christ and the apostles; thousands of pounds of silver and gold, molded for sacred use with all the art that the skill and the genius of the period could produce, adorned the interior, the walls, the dome, the altar, the thrones of the Emperor and the Patriarch. Such splendor overpowered the minds of the barbarians, who compared the beauty and magnificence of the vision with the crude simplicity and wretched barrenness of their native huts.

But if the glory of the visible transcended their dreams of grandeur, the sublimity of the worship overwhelmed their imagination. The chanting of the priests, the intervals of silence, broken by the singing of the "Hallelujah," the "Triumphal Hymn," the celebration of the Divine Mysteries, all lifted the soul beyond the boundaries of time and space to the contemplation of heavenly things. When the embassy returned, they declared to the Tsar, "When we stood in the temple we hardly knew whether or not we were in heaven. . . . There verily God has his dwelling among men, and the worship of other countries is as nothing."

Vladimir yielded, and with feverish ardor for the new religion, like Clovis, king of the Franks, four hundred years before, he commanded his people to forsake their gods and be baptized for the remission of their sins. His subjects obeyed. Thousands plunged into the waters of the Dnieper, and thus was established the Holy Greek Orthodox Church in primitive Russia.

The successors of Vladimir remained steadfast in what had now become the national faith. Moscow and Kiev, Novgorod and other cities of importance developed into centers of religious influence. Inspired by missionary zeal the leaders of the new faith pushed their

labors beyond their immediate limits. Churches grew and were multiplied, schools were established, monasteries after the Greek model were founded, parishes and episcopal dioceses were marked out, and the faith expanded with rapidity among neighboring peoples. Constantinople sent bishops and priests for instruction and guidance. All that the Greek Church possessed was adopted with gratitude, her Creed, her Liturgy, her forms of worship, and form of government, the writings of the great Fathers of the Church in the East, the Acts of the Ecumenical Councils which had defined the faith in opposition to the heresies, the Arian, the Monophysite, the Monothelite, and many others which had disturbed the peace of the Church.

The Church of the Orient had given birth to a religion and a political power which one day would compensate for her losses and become the mortal enemy of that Mohammedanism which had destroyed her churches and her authority in the East.

The history of the Church in Russia is interwoven with the origin and development of the political and cultural institutions of the Russian people. From the beginning it was united with the state, and until the recent revolution was ever a state institution. In

this it did not differ from other Churches in all Christendom, in Europe as well as in Asia from the days when Constantine ascended the throne of the Roman Empire and Christianity itself hid the cross of Christ in the folds of the imperial purple. In all the vicissitudes of the nation, especially during the periods of civil wars, the Church was loyal to the government, and through the long domination of the land by the Mongol-Tatars, and the hundreds of wars with foreign countries, from 1238-1467 A. D., it kept alive the national aspirations of the people, encouraged their warriors on the battlefield, counciled her statesmen, and, though often thwarted, led in all the outreachings of the racial spirit toward such civilizing influences as were possible for her in her isolation from the centers of learning in Europe.

In 1547 Ivan, surnamed the Terrible, ascended the throne. Under previous reigns the Church had alternate periods of repose and turmoil. Under Ivan it seemed at times that her independent existence was dependent upon political exigencies. Ivan was a despot of the Oriental type, cruel, tempestuous, capable of terrific deeds, and yet a ruler withal of talent and compelling power. For many years the nobles of the land had kept the country in a

state of turmoil by their incessant wars and struggles for power. Ivan compelled submission to his authority. He forced the Metropolitan of Moscow to crown him, not as the Grand Prince of Moscow, the usual title of the Russian rulers, but as the Tsar of All-the-Russias. With a strange mixture of cruelty and kindness, austerity and lust, of revenge and remorse, passing his time in prayer and torturing his victims, he was devoted to the Church, which he regarded with superstitious fear. His atrocious deeds, the massacre of thousands of his subjects whom he suspected of rebellion, the murder of his son, whom he slew in an outburst of anger, were in striking contrast to his religious scruples. Fear of the future and love of country combined with the influence of the Church compelled him in a critical hour for the Church to turn a deaf ear to the subtle arguments urged upon him for the union of the Russian Church with the Church of Rome according to the decrees of the Council of Florence.

Nevertheless, during his reign the Church was sunk to the depths of subservience. Helpless in the grip of the tyrant, it sanctioned his violation of the laws of God and man, as state churches often find it expedient to do. In obedience to its principles inherited from

Constantinople of loyalty to the throne, regardless of the character of the ruler, it instilled this teaching into the souls of the people, who, in subjection to their spiritual guides, like the Jacobins in England centuries later in their loyalty to James II, reverently feared the Tsar as the Anointed of God. To this teaching may be traced the devotion of the Russian people to the Tsar despite the evils of his government through the long story of their history, the longest drawn-out agony of the centuries.

Beset on all sides by enemies, his resources exhausted, the monarchy on the verge of ruin, Ivan was reduced to despair. The Church, as usual true to its national instinct, came to the rescue. In response to an appeal from the Tsar for help, a Council was held in Moscow 1580 A. D. and all the vast wealth of the Church scattered throughout the empire was ceded to the crown. At last, broken by turmoil and remorse, Ivan the Terrible laid aside his crown, entered the priesthood, and died in the garb of a monk.

Ivan was succeeded by his son Theodore, 1584-1598 A. D. Too weak to withstand the turbulence of the nobles and the disorder which broke out on the death of his father, he called to his assistance his brother-in-law

Boris Goudonoff, who for fourteen years, having great ambition and little conscience, ruled with iron rigor. He introduced changes among the Russian people which were productive of evils, social and political, and have kept Russia in a condition of discontent even down to the reign of Nicholas II and the outbreak of the Revolution. It had been the custom for peasants to migrate at will from one landed estate to another to the injury of the proprietors and the agricultural interests of the state. Goudonoff promptly applied a remedy. He permanently attached the peasants to the land and thus established serfdom.

The Church also was included in Goudonoff's designs. Hitherto, the Metropolitan was its highest official, its governing authority, but subject in civil matters to the crown, and in canonical law to the Patriarchal See of Constantinople. Restive under foreign authority in ecclesiastical affairs the Tsar, Theodore, revived the desire of complete independence. He was aided in his purpose by the astute Goudonoff. The subject was submitted to the Patriarchs of the East for their compliance by the Patriarch of Antioch, who had visited in Russia and had been loaded with gifts by the Tsar. Before the Eastern Patri-

archs, however, had reached a decision, Jeremiah, the successor in a long line of Patriarchs who since the fall of Constantinople had either been exiled, murdered, poisoned or made victims of indignities and suffering of rebellious priests, or the Sultan or his viceroys, arrived in Moscow. He was received with the honors due to his position. In due time Goudonoff suggested to him that a Patriarchal throne in Moscow would be safer than a precarious rule on the shores of the Bosphorus. The vision of wealth, of honor, and of power which he at once supposed was offered to him stimulated his ambition, though the wily statesman who manipulated him to his designs had no intention of exalting other than a native Russian to the primacy of the Church. In accordance with the secret purpose of the crown, Job, the Metropolitan, called a synod of the bishops to meet in Moscow for the election of a Patriarch. Jeremiah felt confident of election. Three names were presented. The Tsar selected the first, which was not Jeremiah's but Job's, the spiritual adviser of Goudonoff. Disappointed and chagrined at the duplicity practiced upon him, Jeremiah prepared to leave Russia, urging climatic reasons for his speedy departure. He was prevailed upon, however, to delay his return

to Constantinople in order that he should participate in the consecration of the newly elected Patriarch.

On the day appointed for the ceremonial, amid great splendor and surrounded by the Tsar and his court, archbishops, bishops, priests, and the Greek prelates who had accompanied the Patriarch of the East to Moscow, Jeremiah laid his hands upon Job, consecrating him Patriarch, Chief of Bishops, Father of Fathers by the grace of God and the will of the Tsar. Thus was established the Patriarchate in the Holy Orthodox Russian Church.

Goudonoff ascended the throne on the death of Theodore, 1598. His reign was short and inaugurated what was long known in Russian history as "Troublous Times." Civil war, famine, pestilence, devastated the land and made life a burden. Finally the National Assembly elected as Tsar Michael, the son of the Patriarch, Philaret Romanoff. This was the origin of the Romanoff dynasty. In nothing could be seen more clearly the intimate relation between the Russian Church and the Russian state than this unprecedented marvel of a father governing the Church and his son governing the empire.

The period following stands out conspicu-

ously in the annals of Russia as one of conflict between the Church and the crown. The contest has its parallels in the oft-recurring struggles between emperors and popes, kings and bishops in the Middle Ages. Such controversies are inevitable, whether under autocracies or democracies, whenever a civil or an ecclesiastical government invades the sphere of the other. No two governments can occupy the same chair at the same time. Political animosities, however, were not always the cause of these conflicts. In a half-savage state of society, when ruthless autocrats would subjugate the liberties of the people or the rights of the Church, it was but natural that popes or bishops, who were the only bulwark of defense between the people and irresponsible kings, should rebuke their crimes and cool their passions. Russia was not without such champions of human right. Phillip, the humble monk of Solovetsk, braved the wrath of Ivan the Terrible, and with much better reason Nikon, the Great Patriarch of Moscow, could claim the gratitude of his Church in his conflict with the Tsar Alexius than à Becket of Canterbury in his contest with Henry II.

On the other side, attacks on the civil authority by representatives of the Church were not always for the glory of God nor for the

rights of man. History is not lacking in examples of overweening ecclesiastics who, swollen with pride, have dared under the plea of religion to encroach upon kingly prerogatives, often with the result, as in the case of Nikon, of being flung from the heights of power to meditate at their leisure in cheerless exile on the sin of presumption.

Alexius, above mentioned, succeeded Michael, the son of Philaret, in 1645. The Church had grown so great, had accumulated such enormous riches in houses and lands and serfs and pious benefactions, that it vied in influence with the government itself and came near supplanting the authority of the crown and the constitution of the empire. Alexius undertook to curb this rising power. A National Assembly was called to enact laws both for the Church and state. A tribunal was established composed of laymen with authority over the clergy and to which should be submitted for examination the value of all domains and other sources of wealth acquired by the Church. Formerly such matters were solely under the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts presided over by the Patriarch. This sudden exercise of royal authority which seemed to encroach upon the prerogative of the Patriarchate in the administration of the Church,

aroused the determined opposition of the Patriarch Nikon.

Nikon was a typical churchman, of tremendous moral power, of indomitable courage, sincerely religious, and capable of the noblest self-sacrifice for what he considered the inalienable rights of the Church. He attempted to reform the Church, to correct the errors that had crept into the Liturgical books, to give life and vigor to the clergy. His drastic methods and the extent of his reforms arrayed the clergy and the nobles against him. Everywhere revolt challenged his authority. Thousands seceded from the Church and formed the most powerful rival to the Church in Russia, the Old Believers. In his determination to free the Church from the rule of the state he went too far; he asserted the supreme authority of the Patriarch, though he conceded to the Tsar authority over secular affairs.

Alexius was no godless tyrant. But the Church had forced the issue and there could be no avoidance. One or the other, the Church or the state, should be supreme. A solemn Council convened in the Kremlin (1667 A. D.) composed of the hierarchy of Russia and two Patriarchs from the East. Nikon was condemned. When the sentence was pronounced,

Nikon, the champion of the Church, a man of gigantic stature and noble mien, arose, and blazing with indignation at the injustice done to him, defied the Council. Turning to the Eastern Patriarchs, he denounced them with scathing invective for their cowardly subservience to secular power and tearing the precious jewels from his vestments flung them at their feet, crying out with scorn: "Take these; they will support you under Turkish oppression. Get you home. Better stay there than to go wandering like beggars about the world!"

The state had triumphed. But a majority of the clergy and the people revered the memory of Nikon. Under Feodora II, the son of Alexius, an attempt was made to restore him to the royal favor. It was too late. The aged prelate, after a life of battle and storm, desired only to die in peace. However, he was recalled from exile. His journey down the Volga was a triumphal procession. He died at his favorite monastery and the son of Alexius bore him to his tomb.

The period following to the time of Peter the Great was among the stormiest periods in the history of the Church. Dissensions over the reforms Nikon had attempted, the jealousies and rivalries of the prelates, the

arrogance of the "Black" clergy toward the inferior village popes, the "White" clergy; the far-reaching antagonism to all things foreign, kept the Church and the country in constant agitation. But, as usual in such times, national discontent provided the opportunity for the master mind who, feeling himself strong enough to grapple with the situation and to subdue the turbulent elements opposed to him, seized the reins of government and changed the current of the nation's history.

Peter I came to the throne. With that divine intuition of genius which penetrates to the heart of things and understands the needs of the time, Peter, rising above religious and national prejudices, undertook to lift his country out of its cultural and commercial isolation by bringing it under the influence of European civilization. No greater achievement was ever mapped out for any ruler of men; and no greater constructive genius in statesmanship ever succeeded to a greater extent than did Peter, whom posterity has named the Great.

Confining ourselves solely to religious matters, the affairs of the Church now command close attention, for in them may be discerned the beginnings of things which have had powerful influence on the events of the present.

Throughout the empire the Church, like the Church in France preceding the Revolution in 1789, had amassed incredible wealth. Nearly half a million of monasteries and convents with vast domains and hundreds of thousands of serfs, Patriarchal, Metropolitan and Episcopal estates with their thousands of serfs, appropriated large part of the tillable land in every province. Untold riches in jewels, precious stones, sacred vessels in silver and gold, the accumulated treasures of pious benefactions of centuries, in addition to the priceless gems adorning the interiors of churches, cathedrals, and celebrated shrines, were in the possession of the Church. By ancient laws and special decrees of Tsars who would purchase the favor of Heaven by gifts to the Church, this wealth was beyond the reach of the state and exempt from all laws governing other property. The Patriarchs in wealth and pomp vied with royalty. By the prerogatives of rank and the extent of influence they deemed themselves joint rulers of the empire.

Peter changed all this. He practically confiscated the wealth of the Church to the needs of the state and the education of the clergy. He abolished the Patriarchate as a menace to the crown. In its place he established in 1721

A. D. a body of ecclesiastical control named the Holy Synod. This was something entirely new in the administration of the Church but for which he had obtained through the prestige of his power the sanction of the Eastern Patriarchs, and as an institution in the government of the Church it has continued to the present. The Synod consisted of the Metropolitans of Moscow, Petersburg, and Kiev, the Archbishop of Georgia and several bishops. The president was a layman, titled the Procurator, who should be responsible to the Tsar for the administration of his office. Peter also codified the laws governing both the Church and the state, thus taking the government of the Church from the arbitrary rule of the bishops and the Metropolitans. He attempted purification of the Church services and to enforce obedience to the faith of the Church among the numerous sects, especially the Rasnoliki, who had seceded from the National Church in the days of the Patriarch Nikon. He sought to change the manners, the customs, even the mentality of his people, and gained for himself the appellation of "The Anti-Christ."

From the accession of Catherine I, who succeeded him and on down through the reigns of Peter II, Anne, Catherine II, and successive

rulers to the era of the great reforms under Alexander II (1855-1881), the empire slowly advanced in the arts and sciences, in agricultural and industrial resources. Other changes in the intellectual outlook of the people crept in as the enlarging dream of a new order of things was taking possession of the progressive minds of Europe. Peter, in order to carry out his designs of reconstruction, had removed his capitol from Moscow, the center of tradition, and built a new one at Saint Petersburg among the marshes of the Neva on the shores of the Baltic, "a window looking out into Europe." Through that window the new ideas, political, philosophical, and religious, fermenting in the brains of the intellectuals in France and England and Germany, found their way to awakening minds in Russia.

The writings of destructive skeptics which were imperceptibly but inevitably preparing the way for the Revolution in France, Voltaire, Rousseau, D'Holbach, Condorcet, and their colaborers, which were not at first directed against religion but against the Church and the clergy, were the subjects of discussion among the educated few and gradually percolated down to the many. Deism in England, giving rise to rationalism in Germany and infidelity in France, the revolutionary

ideas of liberty in America carried by every wind that blew, fructified thought in Russia, and while religion itself was not openly attacked, blighting unbelief pervaded the higher classes of society.

During the latter part of the reign of Catherine II the French Revolution alarmed all Europe. The King, Louis XVI, and the Queen, Antoinette, with the aristocracy of France, had perished on the scaffold. The throne, the Church, all institutions, the product of the ages, upon which society had rested were swept away, submerged in a river of blood. Ancient laws were abolished. The frenzy of freedom, a newly found liberty, convulsed the nation. A new era was born. All men were declared free and equal, as the American Declaration of Independence had declared and had made its affirmation valid. The appeal of the French revolutionaries to the people of all nations to follow their example thrilled all Europe and did not fall upon deaf ears in Russia. The working men in industrial centers became infected. The vision of a new world of social comfort and civil liberty created an enthusiasm amounting to a religion. The peasantry, however, living apart from centers of industry and commerce and the throbbing life of large cities, re-

mained immovable in their stolid conservatism. Satisfied later with allotments of land which were being gradually increased and which afforded them a living of the only kind they ever knew, they stood adverse to change, the meaning and purpose of which they neither understood nor desired. Therefore they remained devoted to the Church and the Tsar; to the one as the solace of their lives and the gate of heaven, to the other as the vicegerent of God and the Father of his people.

Clear-eyed to the signs of the times, Alexander I attempted to put democratic ideas into effect. His attempted reforms, though belated, did for a time and to some extent quell the spirit of revolt. But in the succeeding reign there was reaction and every weapon was employed to crush revolutionary movements. Nevertheless, the spirit of liberty could not be destroyed. The French Revolution of 1848 inspired the lovers of freedom in Russia. The writings of Alexander Herzen, Michael Bakunin, the brothers Korsheloff, and many others filtrated through all classes and prepared the mass mind for future change. Secret organizations and various political societies increased among the workingmen, and the specter of Nihilism confronted the government. Thousands of revolutionists trod

the weary road to exile, but the ardor of the people never slackened. For every one executed in Russian fortresses, imprisoned or dying in Siberia, ten were ready to take his place in the fighting lines of liberty.

The repressive measures of the government against political agitators reacted also upon the Church. Linked with the state, supported by the state, her bishops and chief prelates, officials of the state, her priests teaching submission to the Tsar as to the will of God, it was not surprising that when once aroused the enmity of the masses should also be directed against the Church. A Church whose interests were identical with the state could not be the representative of God, for a good God would not tolerate a government that crushed the souls of millions in social misery and intellectual darkness. Nihilism, therefore, struck at the Church as well as at the government. It struck at the foundations of religion itself, struck at the social order, familiarized the people with unbelief and thus made war upon God, government, and civilization, as the enemies of the human race. The *intelligentsia* of the present, who have done much to bring about the present conditions in Russia, inherited the atheism of their predecessors and have reaped its Dead-

Sea fruitage in the destruction of their country and their exile in foreign lands. "The stones of the field shall cry out against thee."

If one should attempt to write a history of philosophic thought in Russia, to set forth the influence of Voltaire, Diderot, Hume, Kant, Hegel, Comte, upon an awakening people without a philosophy and a Church without a theology that had ever been touched by the scientific or critical spirit; if he should show how the political and socialistic writings of Fourier, Constant, Saint Simon, Proudhon, Lassalle and Karl Marx had created ideals for the educated classes; if he should clearly manifest how the anti-religious and anti-ecclesiastical writings of German intellectuals Fichte, Feuerbach, Strauss, Stirner and Nietzsche, the evolutionism and agnosticism of Darwin and Spencer and the liberalism of Mill among the English, added to the disintegrating influence French philosophy and atheism had already effected upon a Church steeped in mysticism and miracle, and had created a spirit of revolt against both Church and state, such an historian of intellectual progress, or of philosophic thought, would be laying bare perhaps the most effectual causes, the true dynamic forces which were the true causes of this the most stupendous revo-

lution in human history—the suicide of a nation.

But not only did the Church incur the enmity of the revolutionists by reason of its political connection with the state, it also became the victim of religious antagonism of several millions outside of itself because of the policy of the government to eradicate dissent and to compel unity of belief throughout the empire. The Church had no choice in the election of its civil head, the procurator of the Holy Synod, which was its governing body. He was appointed by the Emperor alone and was responsible to him alone for the administration of his office. The office being a civil office the incumbent might be a layman or a minister, an atheist, as was Dmitri, a Jew, a Mohammedan, or a Christian, as the imperial will should determine, though it would be, of course, wholly improbable that autocracy would insist upon such a monstrous selection as either a Jew or a devotee of Islam, and yet we have seen a Jew become a premier of England and advisor of the Crown, or as a member of the House of Lords make laws for the Church of England.

For twenty-five years, nearly to the breaking out of the Revolution, the procurator of the Holy Synod was a layman, Pobiedonost-

zoff, an incarnation of the quintessence of autocracy. In the opinion of his enemies he had all the requisite qualities of a persecutor—intelligence, narrowness, piety, hatred, kindness, cruelty, vindictiveness, and uncompromising determination to force his will upon the victims of his enmity. An absolutist by conviction, he was a hater of democracy by choice, and regarded with contempt the proletarian millions who struggled for the realization of those political ideals which had taken possession of the working classes of Europe.

His heel was upon the Church and he ruled it with a rod of iron. He would protect the Church from outside evil influences. The highest dignitaries were obedient to his commands and were compelled to administer their offices in harmony with his policy. The persecutions, which for mixed reasons of religion and politics, he waged against all sects—the Stundists, the Old Ritualists, Catholics, Protestants, Jews, all nationalities outside the Orthodox Church, Poles, Lithuanians, Ruthenians, Finns and Tartars—on the ground that variety of religions was incompatible with unity of government, were universally provocative of the deepest resentment against the Church, to which were attributed

the crimes of its authoritative head. Scourging with Cossack whips, banishment, imprisonment, separation of families, of children from their parents, were some of the penalties visited upon recalcitrant dissenters, and upon members of the Orthodox Church who joined an evangelical body, preferring the spiritual experience of salvation in Christ to the empty forms of a state religion. Such was Constantine Pobiedonostzoff.

The successor of Pobiedonostzoff was a German who concealed his nationality under the name of Deviatkoffsky. During the procuratorship of this creature the Church suffered as before. In addition to the evils resulting from intolerance, from a censored press, lack of education, muzzling of free speech, prohibition of assemblies, embezzlement and simony in high places increased the contempt of the educated for the clergy and caused widespread indifference to religion among the masses.

The soul of the Russian is religious. The mystical element in his nature leads him to brood in Slavonic fashion over the deep problems of life and eternity. He would seek in the Church, in its ministries, in its power to lift the soul above material desires to spiritual heights, to that peace of soul which results

from conscious experience of the divine favor, and which alone can satisfy the cravings of the heart. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that if the intelligent classes regarded the Church with rationalistic neutrality, the peasant and the working man, while cherishing piety itself, should look with distrust upon the officials of religion and should mark wide distinction between an official Church and a personal sense of oneness with God—which is religion. Thousands of Russians learned to hate the Church as a political institution, and its ministers as police agents of the government. These swelled the ranks of revolution when the day of retribution came.

The Church could not give what it did not possess. From Constantinople it derived the principles of Christianity, its forms of worship, its Christian literature, its incentive to missionary activity, but it did not receive what the Eastern Church itself did not have—a gospel ministry, the emphasis being upon the use of the sacraments and other means of grace rather than upon the preaching of the word. Isolated from Western civilization by reason of the schism between the Eastern and the Western Churches, the mighty forward movements of the human spirit, such as the Renaissance, the Reformation, the spread of

learning like the widening of the dawn, the sociological, industrial, and commercial developments of Western Europe, and all the sequences resulting from the passing of world-activities from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Atlantic seaboard, made no impression upon the stagnant mind of orthodoxy.

Although applied to the East, the famous lines of Matthew Arnold fitly describe the apathy of the Church in Russia:

> "The East bowed low before the blast
> In patient, deep disdain;
> She let the legions thunder past,
> Then plunged in thought again."

Churches, like other institutions, reap what they sow. Blindness to the signs of the times, which are ever prophetic of a new movement of God in human history, failure to keep step with the progress of thought and the growth of the spiritual in man on the complacent assumption that we "are the people and wisdom will die with" us, cannot result in the long run other than in the triumph of those subtle forces of decay which undermine the stability of all institutions, all "the long results of time," and usher in again the stagnant reign of ignorance and corroding unbelief. The isolation of the Church in Russia from the pro-

gressive movements of the outside world, its ingrained conservatism and atrophied power of adjustment to the needs of the people, widened the gulf between it and the intelligent classes and accelerated its fall.

Like the Church in France when the Revolution swept down upon it, the Russian Church was helpless before the onslaught of the Bolsheviks. It had no master minds, no inspiring leaders in its ministry. In France the great days of Bossuet, of Massillon, of Bourdaloue, preachers who dared kings and held the multitudes in awe, were gone when perdition broke loose, and mediocrities, mere babblers, succeeded, content with the glamour of office and the grabbing of fees. So in Russia. The clergy possessed no prophetic element. They were versed in the Liturgy, in the meticulous details of ceremony, in the canons of the Ecumenical Councils, and the writings of the Fathers, but not in a practical Christianity, individualistic as well as corporate, realistic as well as idealistic, the builder of character and the inspiration of a growing civilization. Divided into two classes, the "Whites" and the "Blacks," between which there were constant feuds, there could be no united effort, no sense of common obligation to instill the invigorating principles of the gospel, social and per-

sonal, into the souls of the people. They seemed to think they were the Church and officially acted as if the people existed for the sake of the Church instead of the Church existing for the sake of the people.

The Black Order of Clergy was composed of monks. From these the higher clergy, the bishops and other officials, were taken. Many of these were scholars of repute, broad-minded and acquainted with the learning of European universities. The White Clergy, or village popes, were the pastors, but not the preachers, often poor, confined to the routine of the prescribed services; and, since the Latin language, which had once been the means of communication between the Eastern and the European nations, had dropped out of ministerial education and ordinary use since the Reformation, and world literature found no expression in Slavonic, uneducated village popes lost touch with Western thought and fell back into ignorance and sloth.

But it should not be inferred that all village priests were of such type. Among them were men of the highest respectability, educated in biblical knowledge, godly examples of piety and sobriety of living. Considering their isolation, the benighted condition of the people, the stolid indifference even among the higher

grades of society to the refining influences of classical culture, it may be to their credit that they were no worse than the clergy of the Church of England were in the time of Charles II, or even so late as the eighteenth century, when the state of morals was such that it was not unusual for a parson to hunt with hounds in the morning, drink in the evening, and come staggering in inebriety from the pulpit at night. Nevertheless, the White Clergy were inferior as a class, thought by many to be closely allied with government spies, opposed to restrictions forced upon them, and ready for any upheaval that might change their condition.

It was, then, not without a show of reason that when the Revolution attacked the Church, the White Clergy of the lowest grade should align themselves with the promised reformation in the Church with the hope of breaking down all barriers of class distinctions and thereby opening the door of opportunity to share in the higher offices of the Church.

Thus preyed upon for long time by the enemies of government and social order, incompetency and corruption in politics, failure in economics, decay in religion, ignorance and poverty, the empire tottered to its fall and the

Church to a period of suffering not experienced in a thousand years.

March 15, 1917, was a fatal day for Russia. On that day the Emperor Nicholas II abdicated the throne. The evil results of long years of repression, the baneful influence of German intrigue, the Japanese war into which Russia had been driven by Germany, the smoldering revolution in the hearts of the people, at length found expression. The volcano exploded. Autocracy collapsed. Under the Tsarist government the Duma, an imitation Parliament, had the privilege of passing laws, but it had no power of executing them. Government was in the hand of bureaucracy. In the Duma there were few experienced statesmen. The consequence was that when bureaucracy broke down in sudden ruin with the abdication of the Tsar, the Duma without commanding leadership suddenly found itself incapable but nevertheless responsible for the carrying on of a government which demanded in such a momentous crisis the ablest minds ever capable of steering a revolution.

A provisional government was formed hastily of a few of the prominent leaders of the Liberal and Socialist Parties, with Prince George E. Lvoff as premier. Paul Miliukoff,

Michael Rodzianko, since dead, Alexander Gutchoff, and Alexander Kerensky held the several portfolios. One by one these, unable to work together, dropped out, except Kerensky, who became President. On his assumption of office the weakness of the government at once became evident. The Russian army at that time consisted of some twelve million, and notwithstanding the terrible trials it had endured on all fronts, the treachery of political leaders and heads of the army, the lack of supplies and the disintegrating influence of German propaganda, it was still capable of glorious achievements. But this army soon became a mob. The weak, vacillating idealist Kerensky, with more of romance and sentiment in his make-up than hard practical sense, ruined it, and in ruining it opened the floodgates of Bolshevism and brought upon Russia the evils she has endured. In an evil hour an order was issued which broke down all discipline. Soldiers were liberated from military obedience to their officers if contrary to their judgment. They need not recognize them by salutes, nor obey orders, nor march in units; it was a "go as you please," a revolutionary army, and all distinctions of rank and authority were abolished. This was freedom. The result, as might be expected, was

disgraceful; everywhere disregard of orders, everywhere shameful retreat, when determined advance would have meant victory. Freed from all restraints, soldiers attacked their officers, left the trenches to hold councils, deserted, roamed, and looted. Thousands joined the Revolution. Those in Petrograd formed the Red Guard and strengthened the extreme radicals assailing the Provisional government.

Among the first acts of the Kerensky government was a proclamation of amnesty to all political exiles. From all countries—from Germany, Switzerland, Siberia, the United States, those who had suffered under the Tsarist government now returned to Russia. Germany facilitated the quick return of the exiles within her borders and those living in Berne, Switzerland, thus seizing the opportunity by such agents, who had lived all their lives in an atmosphere of intrigue, to destroy or obstruct the Kerensky government. Among these exiles were Nicolai Lenin and Leon Trotsky. Immediately on his arrival, plentifully supplied with German money, Lenin linked himself with the Workmen's-and-Soldiers' Delegates. When it was safe for him after his failure to achieve immediate control of the situation, he created riots and other

violent demonstrations in Petrograd, denouncing the provisional government, and seducing the soldiers from their allegiance by declaring for immediate peace with Germany.

The universal discontent, the sufferings of prolonged war, the uprisings among the peasants, the constant agitations fostered by the Bolshevik party with Lenin at its head, mutiny among the soldiers and sailors—all the elements of discord worked together for the destruction of the government. The Constituent Assembly which the provisional government had called for the establishing of a constituent government was the only hope of saving Russia.

The Assembly called for, convened in the great hall of the Tauride Palace in Petrograd January 18, 1918. Before the hour set for the opening, 5:30 P. M., the hall was filled with delegates from all Russia, some four hundred of them, and more were coming—anxious-looking men coming to make a Constitution; armed soldiers with fixed bayonets, some with bombs in their belts, Cossacks with tall sheep-skin headgear, sailors from Kronstad; Working-Men's-Party Delegates in blue blouses; here and there a Greek prelate, or a black-garbed priest not yet aware that his day is over, and whosoever of the populace that

could crowd into the galleries or the niches of space below. The Social-Democratic party occupied space near the tribune; the Bolsheviks, left-wing of that party, a minority, sat opposite, watchful, mockingly tolerant. The Cadet party, or Constitutional-Democrats, were absent, seats vacant, but filled as the moments flitted by with late arriving delegates from afar. Lenin comes from his hiding in a haystack on an island in the Neva, where he has been writing proclamations not yet posted, but which will be read later in London and Paris, Berlin and New York. Lenin, the superman of the twentieth century, who will yet stand the world on its head, has come; has evaded provisional-government soldiers and bloodhounds, but is not yet visible, waiting in the Smolney Institute for his opportunity—the opening of the Drama. The "Internationale" is sung and the throats of a conglomerated mass of humans who have hungered and wept and suffered, fought bloody battles, and dreamed wonderful dreams, break out in cheers; wild party cries and all the resounding vocables that volcanolike burst out in unrestrained energy, expressive of irresistible might, presage a coming change. Kerensky is there, pale, and not wholly certain of himself, nor of others; members of the

Coalition Cabinet are huddled together but will soon escape for their lives. Mlle. Spiridivodor is conspicuous there in the gallery; she who will bravely cry out to Herr Mirbach, German minister, "You cannot make Russia a German colony!" and will yet be shot for complicity in his assassination. Outside, the intermittent rattle of machine guns on street corners, the metallic bang of some stray bullet against a shop window, and a stark body lying here and there in the snow, suggest activities of the Red Guard not encouraging to Constitutional-Democrats coming hither to write a Constitution.

Within, the hour having arrived, a grey-haired man, president for some reason, ascends the tribune and rings a bell. He begins to speak. The Assembly listens: declarations of national peril, of German advance, of the needs of the present and the future, promises of land to the peasants and various sundry affirmations, pertaining to orderly government by constitutional law, are made between increasing interruptions, approvals or yells of objection from diverse groups, Red Guards keeping watch, Bolsheviki showing impatience. Delegate—name not mentioned here—mounts the tribunal. He urges necessity of projects named and is howled down.

Another will try, and by various devices succeeds for a while, subduing the rising tide of opposition. Speech follows speech. Assembly shows signs favorable to stable government, Constitution and the integrity of Russia. The weary hours drag on. The night is far spent. The Bolsheviks begin their tactics —they become threatening, soldiers finger their guns. In the hubbub a sailor steps into the tribune and tells the president to go home: "It is late"; it is "time the Assembly was adjourned." The house is in an uproar, more Red Guards file in and hustle delegates; members of the government flee or are arrested, Kerensky escapes through passageways of the palace and is next heard of after the Gatchinsk affair making ineffectual speeches in Paris and London. The Assembly dissolves like breath in the air and with it the hope of constitutional government. Lenin has triumphed. Bolshevism has become the ruling power in Russia, and for the time being changes the current of her history.

CHAPTER II

THE ATTACK

In June, 1917, during the period of the various Socialistic parties, the Bolsheviki and the provisional government were struggling for supremacy, the Great Sobor, or Conclave, of the Russian Orthodox Church, which had been called by the procurator of the Holy Synod, convened in Moscow. The disorganized state of the Church, the low level to which for a long time it had sunk and the more recently because of its connection with the Rasputin scandal, the condition of the monasteries, the ignorance of the lower clergy, the contemptuous regard in which as a class the priests were held, and the new relation which the revolution had forced upon it, called for a drastic reformation if the Church should survive the storm which had swept over Russia.

This was the first representative Council of the Church that had met since the reign of Peter the Great, in 1721, that is, for over two hundred years. It was composed of the entire hierarchy, Metropolitans, bishops, archbishops, priests, and other delegates; each two

hundred parishioners being represented by two priests and two laymen, the whole number present being one thousand and seventy-two (1,072). For ten days in constant session the Sobor devoted itself to the task of reform. It declared the Church to be free for the first time in its history from political entanglements or alliances. Sectional meetings were held to consider the state of the Church in every part of the country. Plenary meetings were held for open discussion of the recommendations of the sectional meetings. It reestablished the Patriarchate, the Patriarch to be the administrative head of the Church.

The supreme ruling body of the Church was declared to be the All-Russia Sobor, which should meet at regular intervals for making of rules and regulations for the whole Church. The Patriarch is amenable for his administration and conduct to the Sobor, or Great Council.

The Patriarch exercises no autocratic rule but governs in spiritual matters with the Holy Synod, and in temporal affairs with the Supreme Church Council.

All ecclesiastical offices, including bishops, priests, archbishops, and the Patriarchate, shall be filled by elections. Laymen shall be eligible to all the governing bodies of the

Church, the Supreme Council, Diocesan, and Parish Councils.

A distinguished member, Dr. John R. Mott, of the Russian Commission, known as the "Special Diplomatic Mission to Russia," appointed by President Wilson, May, 1917, was present and delivered a formal address. He spoke for an hour, expressing sympathy with the purpose of the assembled prelates to purify the Church, suggesting caution in the critical hour of the Church's life, and cheering the body with words of hope and assurance. At the close of the address the entire assembly arose spontaneously and sang a hymn invoking the presence of the Holy Spirit. The Russian song, "Many Years," followed by other spiritual hymns, evoked holiest fervor. Speeches in response to the inspiring words of the distinguished American known throughout the Protestant world were made by the president of the Sobor, by a distinguished professor in the Moscow University, by Bishop Andrew, of Ufa, in behalf of the Episcopate, and by Prince Troubetsky, expressing the gratitude of the Sobor.

The work of the Assembly was directed to greater efficiency in the Church. Doubtful practices were to be abandoned, corruption among the clergy was to cease, a special com-

mission was appointed to investigate life and study in the seminaries; parish life was to be purified, church schools to be placed under the supervision of the laity. Plans for reinvigorating the whole life of the Church and making it more serviceable to the people were introduced.

Looking back over the work accomplished by this Sobor, the high procurator of the Holy Synod, Vladimir Lvov, declared in July that greater and more significant changes had been effected in the Church during the preceding month than in the past two hundred years. The changes, he insisted, had amounted to nothing less than a revolution.

But the reorganization of the Church was not complete. It was, therefore, decided to finish this necessary program in order that the intended reforms should be carried out and the work of the Church be advanced.

While the Bolsheviks were battling in the streets of Petrograd to overthrow the provisional government, a Convocation of the Bishops was convened in distant Moscow for the election of a Metropolitan for that ancient city. The persecution of the Church had not yet begun, and crowds of people lined the streets witnessing the solemn procession of ecclesiastics and delegates marching to the

Cathedral of Our Saviour, where the election was to be held. Eight hundred delegates and officials, princes, workingmen, and peasants filled the floor and galleries of the Cathedral and participated in the services, which lasted for three hours, so intense was the feeling that a critical hour for the Church was impending and that this might possibly be the last great act they would ever see.

When the hour for balloting arrived, four boxes were placed to facilitate the balloting. There were four candidates, and Archbishop Tikhon, having received the highest number of votes, 481, was declared Metropolitan of Moscow. The new Metropolitan was not unknown in the United States, where he had served for several years as bishop of the Russian Church. A man of exemplary piety, gentle in manner, and an able administrator, his election was received with satisfaction, the splendid ceremonies closing with a *Te Deum* and the hymn, "Many Years." But the reorganization was not yet complete.

The Revolution having severed relations between the Church and the state, provisions for enabling the Church to assume self-government which had been made by the Great Sobor were yet to be carried out, and on August 15, 1917, a Convocation of Bishops met accord-

ingly at Moscow for the election of a Patriarch. It was hoped that by reconstituting the government of the Church, as in former years, the head of the Holy Russian Orthodox Church, now revivified and made independent of the secular power, would be able to steady the Church in the approaching storm and enable it to continue its mission unembarrassed by state affiliations.

The Convocation assembled at Uspensky Cathedral in the Kremlin. This was one of the greatest events in the history of the Russian Church. Two hundred years before, Peter the Great had abolished the Patriarchate and had become himself the nominal head of the Church, thus practically absorbing the Church as a department of the government. The evils which resulted from such a connection were manifest through all the intervening years until they had reached their climax in the degradation of the Church prior to the Revolution. However, notwithstanding the forebodings of the future which the character of the Bolshevik leaders had begun to inspire, the resolution to restore to the Church its ancient government in harmony with the reforms which had been inaugurated at the conclave, strengthened the confidence of the faithful and gave assurance of stability in Church affairs.

The ceremony of inauguration was such as could be witnessed only in the Russian Church still clinging to its ancient liturgy. It was in this same cathedral that the great Patriarch and reformer Nikon was enthroned in 1721. The throne he occupied on that occasion was the same. The vestments he wore were the same, no one having used them since the mighty reformer and champion of the Church who had defied the Tsar and the Patriarchs of the East, had passed to his reward. It was a dignified, worshipful occasion. Members of the Convocation selected three candidates for the suffrages of the body, the Metropolitans of Kharkoff, Novgorod, and Moscow, and, submitting the matter to the will of God, the whole Convocation bowed in silent prayer. A bishop put his hand in the urn and drew out a paper on which was a name. It was Tikhon's, the Metropolitan of Moscow. He was declared Patriarch of Moscow and the Holy Orthodox Church of all the Russias.

A Russian writer describing circumstances attending the inauguration wrote (and it is quoted here from the Atlantic Monthly in order to show the religious status at that time):

> After the liturgy the new Patriarch accompanied a procession round the Kremlin, which he sprinkled with

holy water. The attitude of the Bolsheviki toward this ceremony was peculiar. They did not then feel themselves complete masters of the situation, and had taken up no definite aggressive position with regard to the church, although their hostility was clear. The soldiers on guard at the Cathedral itself behaved very negligently; they did not bare their heads when the ikons and gonfalons passed; they smoked, talked loudly, and laughed. The Patriarch appeared from the Cathedral, a seemingly bent old man, in his round cowl surmounted by the cross, enveloped in the blue mantle of Patriarch Nikon; and I saw the soldiers momentarily bare their heads and rush toward the Patriarch, to receive his blessing through the railings. It was clear that their former attitude had been only superficial bluster, the fashion of the times; but now we saw their real feelings, the result of centuries of training.

The election of Tikhon created bright hopes. In the hearts of the faithful there was the confident hope that the Patriarchate being now restored the Church would be able in the midst of swirling seas of political confusion and the disorganization of society to consolidate, stabilize, and strengthen its ministries. It was the only hope of the nation. Despite the chaos into which society seemed plunging, it only was able to keep alive the sense of God and save the people from moral ruin.

The government, however, did not regard this revival of religious interest with complacency. According to its principles of ag-

gressive atheism it could not permit the Church to exercise any influence over the people it could possibly prevent, notwithstanding its decrees of religious freedom. Everywhere the Patriarch went in performance of his duties he was received with gladness by the people but was hampered by the government. The masses had not yet renounced the teachings of generations, nor did they fail to bestow upon the aged Patriarch every mark of honor and respect due to his rank as the head of the Church. The government, therefore, fearful of his influence and of their own loss of prestige, knowing themselves to be but of yesterday, mere newcomers, and without root in the life-history of the people, ordered the Patriarch henceforth to travel as a private citizen and not in the garb of religion. Tactful, and wishing to avoid conflict, the Patriarch made no objection, nor suggested exemption in virtue of his office. He divested himself of the insignia of his rank and obeyed the orders of the government. The people, however, had more reverence for the Patriarch than respect for the rulings of Moscow. The railway men would place a special carriage at his service. Workingmen in towns and cities, even in Petrograd and Moscow, showed him such honor that the government

did not think it politic at that time to stress its demands too strongly. In Petrograd the people flocked about the Patriarch beseeching his blessing, and despite the watchful enmity of the Bolshevik leaders, accorded him a reception such as had not been witnessed in a generation.

In 1918 the separation of Church and state was decreed (Decrees No. 18. P. 262). It was enacted that all Church and religious institutions or associations shall be subject to the laws governing private associations. That no church or association shall possess the right to property, nor possess the rights of individual persons. That all church property in Russia is the property of the people. It was nationalized.

The Church throughout Russia had large possessions and its wealth enabled it to exercise extended influence. In Petrograd, for instance, churches and monasteries owned nearly 300 houses, shops, building lots, all rent producing. In Moscow the churches owned some thirty-two hotels and 1,054 houses. Throughout the empire in all the large towns and cities revenue-producing properties were owned by the local churches, monasteries, and convents. Outside the cities the churches owned 1,827,000 diastasin of land; the monasteries, 740,000.

As in France, on the eve of the Revolution of 1789, where the Church, it was estimated, owned nearly one fifth of the land, this enormous wealth on which no taxes were paid, and the example of the French Revolutionists gave to the Bolshevik government a color of right, on the ground of public interest, to issue the decree that "the property of all religious associations existing in Russia is pronounced the property of the people."

These decrees are not presented here as evidence in themselves of hostility to the Church. Economic and social necessities may compel a government influenced by the spirit of the times, and even the character of the institutions, to confiscate properties of the Church or to levy taxes upon such as were left in the possession of the Church. Such confiscation was made of the monasteries in England under Henry VIII; and in 1749 the French government passed a law forbidding the organizing of any religious institution without first having obtained permission by letters-patent and registration in Parliament. But neither England nor France was at the time atheistic, nor were their confiscations or restrictions inspired by an atheistic spirit, as the increasing hatred of the Soviet government for everything Christian clearly demonstrates to have

been, though mixed with other reasons, the impelling motive of the Moscow Communists.

Later it was resolved by the Commissariat of Justice concerning execution of the decree of separation of Church and state and of school from Church, that "Charitable, educational, and other similar associations mentioned in Clause 'A' of Article 1, as well as those which, although veiling their religious aims under the guise of charity or education, etc., spend money for religious purposes, shall be closed, all their property being turned over by the Soviet of Workmen-Peasant Deputies to the corresponding commissiariats or departments." *Decrees 1918 No. 62, P. 685.*

Article 4 of this same decree declares:

All property which at the time the Decree concerning the "Separation of Church and State, etc.," was promulgated, was under the management of the Orthodox Ecclesiastical Department and other religious and ecclesiastic institutions and associations, shall under the Decree be transferred to the direct management of the local Soviets of Workmen-Peasant Deputies, on conditions laid down in the following articles.

5. The local Soviet of Workmen-Peasant Deputies shall make it incumbent upon the representatives of the former ecclesiastical departments or other persons belonging to the given religious creed, in whose actual possession and management the Church and all other property for purposes of religious worship, to compile in triplicate, a specification of all property intended specially for the performance of divine service and re-

ligious rites. According to such specification the Soviet of Workmen-Peasant Deputies takes over the property from the representatives of the said religious cult, and hands it over, together with the specifications, for use free of charge, to such local inhabitants of the same religious creed who want to use such property; the second copy of the specification, with the signatures of those who have taken the property over, shall be kept in the local Soviet of Workmen-Peasant Deputies, while the third copy is to be sent to the Commissariat of Education.

6. The number of local inhabitants required for obtaining the use of such ritual property shall be fixed by the local Soviet of Workmen-Peasant Deputies, but can not be less than fifty persons.

The school is separated from the Church. No religious instruction of any kind or creed shall be permitted in any state or public school or in any private institution in which general instruction is given. Individuals may give or receive religious teaching in private, but not in a body. Births, marriages, deaths are to be registered and solemnized by secular authorities only and not by any religious authority. All moneys belonging to religious institutions abolished by the state shall be taken over by the Soviet of Workmen-Peasant Deputies, who may on certain conditions permit such amount to be retained as shall enable the Church or association to perform religious rites to the end of the year. Many

other laws covering the minutest detail of church life were passed and enforced with rigor.

To the separation of Church and state no one who believes in liberty of conscience, in the inalienable right to worship God in any manner he pleases, not contrary to natural law and subversive to the moral sense of the community, can oppose rational argument. And no greater blessing, whatever its motive, could have come to the Russian Church than the total separation of the Church from the state. To submerge the Church in the state is to abandon religious freedom; to submerge the state in the Church is the negation of liberty. A free Church in a free state, each in its own sphere indispensable, and both working for the highest moral and social well-being of the people, are in accord with the highest conception of the true relations which should exist between Church and state.

But the Soviet government, whatever may have been its civil or moral right to confiscate the property of the Church (Peter the Great had done the same practically, and there was no great protest), clearly indicated that its real motive was not purely secular. In addition to this act of confiscation and abolishment of certain associations, and contrary to

its own principles of equality in the state, it enacted decrees against all ministers of all religions, Russian Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Protestant, Jew, or Mohammedan, depriving them of the essential privileges of citizenship—the right to vote or to participate in the government of the country.

The Soviet Constitution, Sec. 65, Chap. 13, declares: "The following persons shall neither have the right to vote nor be voted, even though they belong to one of the categories enumerated above—namely, (1) Persons who employ hired labor in order to obtain from it increase in profit. (2) Monks and clergy of all denominations."

This, taken with the restrictions which were thrown around the ministers of religion in preaching and teaching; the banishment of religious teaching in all schools, public and private, colleges and universities, and the aggressive propaganda among the people in the interest of atheism, showed the determined purpose of the Soviets to eliminate religion from the Russian people. The goal to be reached was an atheistic government in an atheistic state.

That a government has the right to determine who shall be citizens of the state and who shall vote is elementary, but among a

free people a government has that right only when it is so determined by the people. Otherwise it is the arbitrary act of an oligarchy, the expression of a tyranny which supports its unauthorized fiats and decrees only by the force of arms.

The decree forbidding religious teaching except in private, while also within the province of the state, also revealed the animosity of the government, accompanied as it was with other restrictions, such as doing away with infant baptism and instruction in religion of anyone under the age of eighteen. Since all the people are taxed for the maintenance of public education, and since all do not profess the same religion, and the state cannot supply schools for each creed or confession, the state has the right in the public interest to forbid the teaching of any particular faith or the wearing of garbs distinctive of any faith in the schools supported by the state. But between such a situation and the evident purpose of the Soviet government there is a wide difference. The substitution of materialistic teachings, denying the existence of God and the spiritual nature of man, denouncing Christianity as historically false and philosophically absurd, is as contrary to the rights of the people as if the government should in-

sist that only a certain faith or form of religion should be taught in the schools.

Prior to the Revolution there were in the empire 45,235 elementary schools, 109,631 teachers, and 3,360,167 pupils under the supervision of the ministry of public instruction. Under the Holy Synod there were 43,969 schools, 95,000 teachers, and 1,782,883 pupils. Other ministries had in charge 1,738 schools, 3,885 teachers, and 201,697 pupils; total number of pupils, 5,373,747. According to the report of A. V. Luncharsky, Soviet Commissar of Education, 1922, there were 5,000,000 pupils. Considering the terrible trials, unutterable suffering, and universal disorder Russia endured, this is a remarkable report.

But in October, 1922, there was a loss of 13,000 schools and 1,000,000 pupils. The high schools are supported largely by the Soviet government and the fees which are paid by students who are not Communists. According to Luncharsky, 10,000 Communists are in these high schools, the principal textbooks being the works of Lenin and Karl Marx and *The A. B. C. of Communism,* by Bukharin. Under the old regime religion was one of the principal subjects taught in the schools. Under the Soviet rule it is not only not taught but is positively prohibited. Thus a new genera-

tion is growing up in Russia which will be as alien to Christianity, to all religions, as the teachings of atheism drilled into them in childhood and youth can make.

The Red Army, which is the chief support of the Soviet government, and without which it would not endure for a day, is also made an agent for Communism through the military schools. Each year hundreds of thousands of youth are called to the colors for training, and while illiteracy is thereby reduced, Communism, which is the persistent foe of Christianity, is taught as an essential part of the curriculum not only as a social study but in order to make it the soldier's own creed. By such means the soldiers become the defenders of the doctrines they have been taught and associate their creed with the safety and prosperity of the state. In the Survey Graphic, 1923, Mme. Lenin, the wife of Premier Lenin, under the heading "A Nation at School," wrote:

> The Red Army alone has become a mighty propagator of education. All young men go through that army, and the two years they serve in it are not educationally wasted. Wherever there are soldiers there are Red-Army training schools for various occupations as well as libraries and social clubs. At the present moment, there are more than twelve hundred Red-Army clubs to which are affiliated 6,200 political, educational, agri-

cultural, and other societies, with a total membership of more than 130,000. In these clubs lectures are given, reports made, propaganda plays are staged and the stage settings for them made; excursions are organized; current-event clubs discuss the news. It is only natural that a Red-Army soldier when he returns to his village is eager to organize there a club, or at least a reading room.

Madame Lenin seems to have adopted the theories of the French philosopher Condorcet, that a state system of education for children, the teaching being determined by the state, would be the most powerful means of creating a new intellectual, political, and social world. If Communism be instilled into the minds of the young to the exclusion of all other beliefs, whether religious or economic, the future of Russia as a Communistic state will be assured. Like others who build fine theories of Socialism issuing in the perfectibility of human society, Madame Lenin forgets one element necessary to her theory—that is, human nature. As man becomes more intellectual he becomes more individualistic. He leaves the herd. He becomes independent; fences off his own field, asserts his own terms—and with this Communism can never come to terms. She also forgets that the winds will not cease blowing over Russia. The currents of the world's thinking, and the mighty forces work-

ing in human society will find their way even into Russia, as they have, and no state education will be able to withstand their impact upon the thought and life of her people.

In addition to this agency, which, while serving the state and being educated in the Communistic theories of a body of men which were not chosen by the people, there is also a tremendous anti-religious force, another growing power fostered by the government. The work of this agent is to educate the adult population in those same principles. Concerning *Politprosiets,* or societies for political education, Madame Lenin says:

> *Politprosiets*, or societies for political education, are another means of spreading culture. Under their control we find elementary schools teaching adults to read and write, schools for others who are literate, Soviet schools, libraries of various kinds, reading rooms, clubs. The government appropriates considerable sums for the organization of these institutions. Besides, the *politprosiets* are supported by the Communist party, and they are closely connected with the Communistic organizations of young people, with the cultotdel, culture department, the trade unions, and the women's department.

Thus the Soviet government, by prohibiting the teaching of religion in the educational institutions of the country, seeks to undermine the future of Christianity in Russia. For

whatever those outside Russia may think of Communism as a social theory, in Russia it is a religion. Just as Christianity itself having overthrown the pagan religions, and confiscated the temples of the gods to Christian uses, became the religion of the people, so the Communists having destroyed Christianity as far as they are able, or rendered it ineffectual as a belief, consider Communism to have superseded the former religion of the empire. When, therefore, the new recruits return home from military training they become ardent propagandists of those ideas and doctrines in their several villages. In European Russia there is an average of one village to every 4.7 square miles, and thus the work of the Church is challenged and slowed down over large sections in a short time, especially so when the propaganda of the returned soldiers is defended by the Soviets in the village who would quickly apprise the government of counter-revolutionary and religious activities against the government.

The fruits of this education were manifested in Moscow during Christmas, 1922. Bands of young men and women paraded the streets singing parodies of Christian hymns and carrying effigies of the gods of the various religions, effigies of Jesus Christ, of the Virgin

Mary, of the apostles, representations of Almighty God, the Jehovah of the Jews, and of Mohammed the Prophet of Islam. The vilest contempt was exhibited by these youthful Communists for these "gods," who were now receiving their just dues for having so long deceived the people. The whole impious revelry closed at night with huge bonfires into which the effigies were flung accompanied with ribaldry and outrage.

The defenders of Sovietism who find it necessary to divert attention from such fruitage of atheism in the schools, while loudly proclaiming that there is no illiteracy in the army, that under the Soviet there is education everywhere, endeavor to excuse these manifestations and to exonerate the government from responsibility for such gayety of blasphemy. But it must be evident to every rational mind that the government is responsible. Such a contempt for religion is the natural fruit of the government's teaching, prohibitions, and restrictions. "Men do not gather grapes from thorns, nor figs from thistles." The government by reason of its interlockings with the Communistic party may not order such demonstrations, for the simple reason that the various societies organized under Professor Stephanoff and other atheists for "combating

religion," with the knowledge and by the authority of the government, relieves the government of the trouble.

With its strict censorship—police agents, spies, and *provocateurs* everywhere—nothing is done without the knowledge of the government. No book is published, no newspaper printed, no manifesto or decree of Provisional Soviets issued without authority of the government. The post offices and telegraph offices are government property, but these were covered as were the bookstalls with vilest anti-Christian posters. The "Atheist," "Godless," or "Without God," a publication subsidized by the government, publishes without hindrance cartoons reviling Christianity so revolting that no printing press outside of Russia would reproduce them. Three of these reveal a diabolism beyond expression. One represents Almighty God, Jehovah, in company with Mohammed and Jupiter, seeking a grave in "the cemetery of the gods" in which to hide himself. Another is a workman climbing the walls of heaven to drag God from his throne. The third—the civilized world never looked upon anything so diabolical in its expression of hatred and contempt for the most holy sacrament of the Christian religion! During the frenzy of the French Revolution of 1789 sacred

vessels of the Church were seized by drunken mobs, the vestments of the priests were torn into rags; a courtesan of the streets was carried on men's shoulders and "escorted," as Carlyle paints it, "by wind music, red nightcaps, and the madness of the world," placed on the high-altar of the Notre Dame Cathedral and worshiped as the Goddess of Reason. (The poor woman died as late as September 30, 1863, ninety years old, blind, idiotic, and a beggar.—Note in Dean Farrar's *Witness of History to Christ.*)

Carlyle's description of this specimen of atheistic insanity is terrible, and in his thorough-going fashion he blasts it with withering scorn. But this cartoon makes one shudder at the depth of depravity to which it is possible for human nature to sink. The French Revolution in its wildest delirium never equaled it. The dead Christ released from the cross is stretched out and lies disemboweled to the gaze of all. Here, one, with the ravages of hunger distorting his face, is tearing a piece of flesh from his body. Another is gnawing like a dog at one of his bowels; another is holding a cup catching the blood that spouts from his opened side, and under this picture is the legend: "This is My Body: This is My Blood."

This publication is subsidized by the Soviet

government. The following translations, by responsible translators and vouched for by those known to the author, from the *Izvestia,* the official government organ; from *Pravda,* official paper of the Russian Communist party, which is the same as the government, and other Russian papers, shows the attitude of the government toward the Church and religion:

Moscow, *Trud,* April 4, 1923:

The Moscow Provincial Department of Communal Economy has granted 15,000,000,000 roubles ($1,200) for the organization of the Easter of the Communist young people. Anti-religious placards are prepared and anti-religious literature is being secured. In every club of the Communist economists evening performances will be arranged with an anti-religious program.

The central cultural workers have made a proposal to the provincial departments of the cultural workers to open a campaign among the large masses toward refusal to take part in religious ceremonies.

During the Easter holidays it is proposed to arrange lectures and discussions on the origin of Easter and organize, for the stage, plays anti-religious in character.

To keep children away from religious exercises during the Easter holidays it is proposed to cooperate with the Russian Union of Communist Youth in order to arrange children's festivities in the schools, children's homes, and clubs.

Moscow, *Izvestia,* April 5, 1923:

Number four of the magazine "Bezbozhnik" (Without God) has been published. Considering the fact that

this issue is particularly important for the anti-religious propaganda the Agitation Department of the Moscow Committee of the Russian Communist Party has directed all Secretaries of the Communist germ-cells to circulate the copies in their enterprises. The copies can be secured as before and on the same terms from the office of the magazine.

Moscow, *Pravda,* April 12, 1923:

A steady and cleverly organized anti-religious propaganda is now bringing results.

The religious fog is evaporating out of the brains of the workmen. They are nearing a step at a time toward triumph over the prejudices of ages, over the religions that have lived for thousands of years. It was determined not to celebrate Epiphany, January 19. Whoever should not come to work was to be fined two days' wages. Such was the decision of the general meeting.

However, no one had to pay the fine, because all had appeared.

Utilization of Churches

The Moscow Soviet resolved to close out the church house of Jesus Christ on Duenovoi Street, Ostrozhenka, and to convert it into a club for trolley workmen.

The workmen's faculty of the Petrovsky Agricultural Academy has filed a petition for the closing out of a church in the estate "Grachevo" and its conversion into a club and a rest house for the students of the workmen's faculty.

The germ-cell of the hospital in the name of Radishnev has voted to ask the Moscow Soviet to close out the church of Christ at the said hospital and to convert it into a club for invalids.

The Committee of Residents of the house Number 22, Danilovsky-Kamer-Kollexhsky Street, filed an applica-

tion with the Administrative Department for the closing out of the church of Danilov Monastery and to turn it into dwelling rooms. Permission was granted.

The Moscow Soviet has closed out a church in Marfino village and converted it into living quarters.

Moscow, *Izvestia,* April 24, 1923:

Rostov-on-Don, April, 21: The students of a local Technicum and the Workmen's faculty of Taganrog filed a petition to close a synagogue and turn it into a club.

Tsaritsyn, April 22: The soldiers of Artillery stores located in the outskirts of the city have taken over the local church on the territory of stores. The building has been turned into a boarding house and library.

Moscow, *Izvestia,* May 24, 1923:

Quoted by the New York "World" Correspondent, Riga, May 21, 1923:

"Batum, April 4. The League of Communist Youth at the request of the young Jewish workers passed a resolution demanding the synagogues for cultural and propaganda purposes."

"Kutais, April 10. The local synagogue was given over to the League of Communist Youth."

Moscow, *Izvestia,* May 24, 1923:

Considering the fact that no places of religious worship are allowed to be attached to state institutions, the Administrative Department is closing all the chapels in the hospital buildings. The chapels of the Medvedinskaya, the first and second Municipal hospitals and the nurses' school on Sobachia Ploshchadka have been already closed. In the near future twenty more similar chapels will be closed.

And yet there are those, even some Christian ministers, who defend the Soviet government while denying it; who, while regretting their "methods," yet defend their purpose; who skillfully laud the educational efforts of the government to eradicate illiteracy in Russia but cleverly omit the education which is forced upon the youth of Russia, and proclaim in the face of all evidence from governments, diplomats, relief agencies, religious workers, newspaper correspondents, Bolshevik statistics, that there is no religious persecution in Russia. One editor of a Christian paper, who was a few days in Russia, announced that he had seen no evidence of religious persecution in Moscow—a statement probably true, but which could be just as truthfully made of a slaughterhouse when the blood is wiped up.

Of the Soviet laws on marriage and divorce nothing can be alleged that may not be said concerning similar laws in other countries—France, England, Scotland, the United States. The difference from the viewpoint of religion is that marriage in the Eastern Church is held in more sacramental reverence than in the Western Churches. But it was not always so. In the time of Justinian, according to the Hon. James Bryce, there was no law in the Chris-

tian empire which prescribed forms or methods for entering the marriage state, nor were any public records of marriage kept. The state had nothing to do with what was considered a private affair. Nor were there any laws governing divorce. The sanction of the Church was not required to make marriages or divorces legal. Even according to the canon law of Christendom, which was codified in the thirteenth century, and so far as relates to the Western Church down to the Council of Trent, nothing more was required to the validity of marriage than the formal consent of the interested parties. This was the common law, although the Church and the law considered that such consent should be declared in the presence of a priest, but it was not obligatory, and marriage was legally valid without any recognition or benediction of the Church. The Council of Trent, Session XXIV, Cap. 1, however, decreed that all marriages should be held invalid unless solemnized by a priest and in the presence of witnesses. The Protestant countries did not recognize the decrees of the Council, and from that date there has been no universally recognized law of marriage in Western Christendom.

It is not necessarily evident, therefore, that

the Soviet laws of marriage and divorce are, in themselves, to be considered as manifestations of enmity toward the Church, though, of course, they are so interpreted by the Church. In the United States no minister can solemnize a marriage without legal license, but this is no evidence of religious antipathy, the state recognizing marriage as a civil institution only. The purpose to dechristianize Russia and to wholly blot out the Church and religion from the very soul of the people is seen in the law, as interpreted by the Church, that no marriage is legally valid if solemnized in a church or by a minister of religion. The only requisite to a valid marriage in Russia is that the parties desiring to marry shall appear before a magistrate or other civil official and sign a marriage contract.

But if marriage is thus easy, it is just as easy to dissolve it. Within an hour, for any cause, both parties, or one of them, may appear at a register's office, sign a paper provided for the purpose, and be free to marry again before the ink is dry. Whatever the Russian Church may allege, even this law in itself, it must be conceded, is no direct evidence, apart from all other evidences, of being specially directed against religion. What may be argued by the Church, the same may

be urged against similar laws of France and of the United States.

While it is true that the Bolshevik government has not ordered or sanctioned the nationalization of women as the Soviets of Vladimir, and those of Ekaterinodar in South Russia had decreed, nevertheless, the gulf between nationalization and the Russian law of divorce is neither very wide nor immovably fixed. The nationalization of women is not incompatible with Communistic principles. Lamartine, in his *History of the French Revolution* of 1848, wrote, "Communism of goods leads, as a necessary consequence, to Communism of wives, children, and parents." This is not a farfetched conclusion, nor is it one which real Communists deny. Karl Marx, the apostle of Russian Communism, in the *Communist's Manifesto,* the joint production of himself and Frederick Engels, and a textbook in Russian schools, endeavors to take the edge off the accusation, since avowal of such a principle would have destroyed at the time he wrote all prospect of communistic teachings being heard:

> The bourgeois claptrap about the family and education, about the hallowed corelation of parent and child, became all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of Modern Industry; all family ties among the

proletarians are torn asunder and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labor.

But you Communists would introduce community of women, screams the whole bourgeoisie chorus.

The bourgeois sees in his wife a mere instrument of production. He hears that the instruments of production are to be exploited in common, and, naturally, can come to no other conclusion than the lot of being common to all will likewise fall to the women.

He has not even a suspicion that the real point aimed at is to do away with the status of women as mere instruments of production.

For the rest, nothing is more ridiculous than the virtuous indignation of our bourgeois at the community of women which, they pretend, is to be openly and officially established by the Communists. The Communists have no need to introduce community of women; it has existed almost from time immemorial.

Our bourgeois, not content with having the wives and daughters of their proletarians at their disposal, not to speak of common prostitutes, take the greatest pleasure in seducing each other's wives.

Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common, and thus, at the most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with, is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized community of women.

Bebel, a well known international writer and leader in Socialism, teaches that "the bourgeois marriage is a consequence of bourgeois property." Therefore, according to Gabrielle Deville, the greatest among French Socialists, "when property is transformed, and only after that transformation, marriage will

lose its reason for existence, and boys and girls may then freely and without fear or censor listen to the wants and promptings of their nature." Two of the leaders of Socialism in England, Mr. Belfort Bax and Mr. H. Quelch, also affirm that "when private property ceases to be fulcrum around which the relations between the sexes turn, any attempt at coercion moral or material . . . must necessarily become repugnant to the moral sense of the community." Much more could be presented showing the principles underlying Socialism and Communism, the adopted social creed of the Soviet government.

Such was the attitude of Moscow. Such were the dominating ideas of Communistic Sovietism in its opposition to the Church before the storm broke in its fury and marked an epoch in Russian Church history.

Political beliefs or economic theories of governmental officials, however, rarely interest the masses, who are more concerned with their personal affairs than interested in policies of government or philosophical opinions. Unless some unusual situation or project vitally affect their interest, the business of government, itself a mystery to most, and far removed from the immediate care of the average man, is allowed to take its course.

Anxiously watched by the hierarchy and the lesser clergy, who clearly understood the significance of this Sovietic hostility, the religious life of the people was carried on outwardly as usual. The storm brewing over their heads had not yet broken. In cities, towns, and in the rural districts the faithful as usual flocked to cathedral, church, or shrine. There, in the dim interior, with images and pictures of the saints or other suggestive aids to devotion such as appealed to the Russian imagination, the chanting of the Liturgy, the splendid ceremonials celebrating the mysteries of religion, went on as before. Everywhere, especially on public buildings, the government had displayed posters flaunting the legend, "Religion is the opiate of the people," but the people enjoyed the "opiate" and went on their way to pray heedless of the forces at work within the walls of the Kremlin, confident that amid life's storms the Church was the haven of the soul and that the unseen forces which make for good are greater than those that work for evil.

On the part of the Bolsheviks the internal situation demanded caution. The people were not yet ready to throw aside the traditions of centuries for philosophical theories they did not understand. To attack religion violently,

therefore, would be bad politics. Not only would it have been contrary to their declared principles of freedom of religion, but such premature adventure would more likely arouse deep-seated antagonism and thus not only frustrate the plans of the Bolsheviks but also probably endanger the existence of the government. Religion lies deeper than politics. In defense of their country against foreign invasion or counter-revolution thousands would align themselves with the Communists, as they had done, but they would be just as likely to fight these same Communists to death in defense of their faith.

The situation called for other methods. The government, therefore, limited its anti-religious activities to incessant propaganda. This, then, was carried on by every means among the working men in the industrial centers and among the peasants, who were made to believe that the Church favored the return of monarchy and of depriving the people of the land, the freedom, and the other benefits the Revolution had won, especially of the land which the Bolsheviks had promised. Self-interest inspired by greed is among the strongest appeals that can be addressed to human nature, the primal instinct of which is self-preservation.

The leaven worked. The bishops and clergy were accused of fostering plans to overthrow the Revolution and of giving their blessing to foreign enemies of the country. By such methods the people, filled with dread memories of the Tsarist regime, responsive to patriotic appeals and fearful of losing their liberties, would naturally be estranged from a suspected clergy, and gradually become divided or confused in their loyalty between the Church that would destroy the Revolution and the government that would maintain it.

The opportunity of the government for more drastic measures soon came.

CHAPTER III

T'CHEKA

It is self-evident that every government has the right, legal and moral, to defend itself against all enemies within and without. It is equally evident that for this purpose it has also the right to employ every means. If it is unable to protect itself, to safeguard the lives and liberties and possessions of its people, it ceases to be a government and the right of self-protection falls back to the people in whom all government originates, and by whom it is maintained. This is only saying that a legitimate government has the right to exist.

If by a sudden seizure a political party should usurp supreme authority in the state, the result is not a lawful but an unlawful government and may be rightfully resisted. Every attempt to defend itself only adds to its original crime. It has no authority. A government which had its beginnings in revolution, in a *coup d'état* or in conquest, as every modern state has had—England, France, Sweden, the United States—or by any means other than by inheritance, or title, such gov-

ernment may become a legitimate government through lapse of time, it being acquiesced in by the people. The justification of a revolution must be determined by its results.

The Bolshevik regime is not a lawful government. It is an usurpation begun in and supported solely by armed force. It is now recognized, however, by certain governments as a government *de jure,* and this does give it in its relations with those governments a lawful standing. But the whole world knows that such recognition does not rest upon any authority conferred upon the Bolsheviks or Soviets by the people but because of the economical necessities of those governments. Poverty, like politics, makes strange bedfellows. Unemployment in England has a wonderful effect upon the foreign policy of Downing Street. President Wilson refused to recognize the Huerta government in Mexico because, as a chief reason, that presidency had been obtained through bloodshed and murder. So the Soviet government ruling in Moscow.

The Revolution in Russia was an accomplished fact begun and established by the people, and a provisional government was in existence. It was a legitimate government. The Bolsheviks had been overwhelmingly defeated by vote of the people when a General

Assembly of the people's representatives had been called to enact a Constitution, and they had no mandate to overthrow the government then existing, nor to prevent the formation of a constitutional government at that time determined upon by the people. Supported by an army and suppressing resistance by ruthless force, the Bolsheviks dissolved that Assembly, and instead of a Constitution they imposed upon the people an oligarchic form of government which has not been indorsed, and cannot be opposed without recourse to arms. The people were helpless. They had no arms and to possess such was declared to be a counter-revolutionary crime worthy of death.

Had this oligarchy given the people a government of their own choosing and under which they could have acquired land, which was among the principal rights they had fought for; had the people been permitted to develop industry and trade and commerce on their own initiative and in harmony with the established customs of civilized nations, there might have been, considering the demoralized condition of Russia at the time, some shadow of justification for their seizure of power and the tyranny they exercised to retain it.

But it was not the purpose of the Bolsheviks

to give Russia a free government. Their purpose was to inaugurate a world-revolution, a class-war of workers against capitalists in all nations and to use Russia as a means by which such a revolution might be accomplished. To this end they forced upon the people an economic theory, the Communistic theory of Karl Marx, as the fundamental principle of government, a theory which, as results have proved, is absolutely impossible in practice, and which they have themselves now abandoned for a new economic policy, the N. E. P., after shedding rivers of blood and the destruction of Russia's industrial and commercial resources to enforce it upon a reluctant people.

While the theory itself was not new, yet never in the history of the world was there anything like such a tyranny except the forcing of Mohammedanism upon the people of Asia Minor at the edge of the sword. The usurpers were in desperate straits. Famine, banditry, and insurrection kept the land in turmoil. The army, engaged on various fronts, could not be everywhere maintaining order, and anarchy slowly destroyed what the ravages of war had left. In order to repress crime and to resist revolution among the masses, certain tribunals were established

which, like Committees of Safety during the Reign of Terror in the French Revolution, filled the prisons with suspects and executed their judgments without appeal. These organizations were:

The People's Courts, decreed November 24, 1917.

The Revolutionary Tribunals, decreed November 24, 1917.

The Extraordinary Commission (Tchrezvichaia) decreed October 30, 1918. All civil and criminal cases were at first under the jurisdiction of the People's Courts, and all cases of sabotage and counter-revolution were tried before the Revolutionary Tribunals. But, since these Courts were unable to suppress increase of crime and antagonism to the government, it was found necessary to establish another Tribunal, the T'cheka, or Extraordinary Commission for combating counter-revolution, which in practice superseded the functions of the other tribunals.

Endowed with "extraordinary" power, the authority of this institution was unlimited. Having the right to investigate every assembly, to ferret out every crime, to run down every rumor of counter-revolution, to prosecute and to punish, it could arrest anyone, day or night, on mere suspicion, a man in the

street or an official of the government. Its spies and informers were omnipresent. They penetrated every calling, profession, and business of life, industry, the army, navy, consulates, the schools, clubs, the privacy of the home, utilized the bonds of friendship, the love of parent for child, the discontent of priests and the sacred confidence of the Church. No human being, organization, or institution, secular or religious, was beyond the reach of its power. By imprisonment, torture, or the fear of death, it wrung from the soul of its victim incriminating charges against innocent neighbors.

The headquarters of the All-Russia 'Cheka is situated in an immense building formerly occupied by an insurance company on Bolshaya Toubianka Street, Moscow. Connected with the main building is an annex called the "Death Ship," where those sentenced to die are confined. A former official in the Petrograd Department of Justice, Boris Brasnol, thus describes it in his invaluable documented book *The Balance Sheet of Sovietism,* page 155 (Duffield & Co., New York):

"To the right of the entrance there is a big room with a balustrade extending along four walls. In the center there is an open space with a spiral stairway leading down to the

cellar in which those condemned to die are kept. In one of the stone walls of the 'hold' small cells are cut out. These are the so-called 'Chambers of Departing Souls.' Therein the victims are left to live their last hours. Profound silence reigns there, for no noise from the outside can reach the underground. Here every link with life is severed. In the evenings, after sunset, the death numbers are called out from upstairs, and the cells when vacated are immediately reoccupied by those who are 'next' on the 'Cheka execution list."

The horrors of this House of Death could not be imagined if some one who had experienced the agony of incarceration there had not come forth to tell the story. By a miracle one did manage to escape and the author of *The Balance Sheet of Sovietism* translates from the Russian the narrative of the victim, thus:

At the end of January, 1921, I was thrown into the "Ship," where there were two others awaiting their turn to die. . . . Those who were tried by the "Troyka" usually were executed on Wednesdays and Saturdays. Therefore, on Wednesday, January 26, they clearly realized that this was their last day. Still they were apparently very quiet, and even at dinner they applied to the foreman with the request: "Pour us some thick stuff! Mind, you are feeding us to-day for the last time." . . . Around six o'clock, the man on duty appeared, giving instructions to evacuate all those who

had been casually thrown into these cells. Then it became apparent that in a few minutes the remaining ones would be taken out for execution. Our two single cells were open but there was no chance to converse with the men in the adjoining cells as the jailer closely watched every move of theirs. In spite of this, they succeeded in hastily destroying some pencil notes. However, an hour later the executioner, Pankratov, accompanied by the commandant, Rodinonov, came down to the cellar. Persons sentenced to death were called out of their cells and ordered to undress. They took off their overcoats, suits, and even their shirts. They undressed very quickly as though they were in a great hurry. Their faces were very pale. Their emotion was so strong that some of them proved unable to stand firmly on their feet, and then they would fall. But once more they would get up. They smoked one cigarette after another and kept deadly still. After that, also without saying a word, promptly, almost running, the six began to mount the spiral stairway. . . . We were as though paralyzed on the spot. Benumbed, we watched them leave. I was struck by the thought that the same fate was awaiting me. Soon afterward the guards came in and took the belongings of the victims. The food was immediately divided among them, while some of their clothes were later observed on the executioner, Pankratov. Twenty minutes later a truck passed through the gates of the Moscow 'Cheka. . . . It was the truck which carried away the dead bodies of the executed, taking them to the Lefort morgue for postmortem examination and burial in a common grave. The judgment against the executed was rendered in default. For six weeks they had been waiting to be executed.

Every important city had its 'Cheka. The Rev. R. Courtier-Forster, British Chaplain at Odessa in 1919, in his work *Bolshevism*,

Reign of Torture at Odessa, reprinted from the London Times of December 3, 1919, and quoted by Brassol, gives this terrible description:

> The house in the Catherine Square in which I was first in captivity afterward became the Bolshevists' House of Torture, in which hundreds of victims were done to death. The shrieks of the people being tortured to death or having splinters of wood driven under the quick of their nails were so agonizing and appalling that personal friends of my own living more than a hundred yards away in the Vorontsoffsky Pereulok were obliged to fasten their double windows to prevent the cries of anguish penetrating into the house. The horror and fear of the surviving citizens was so great that the Bolshevists kept motor lorries thundering up and down the street to drown the awful screams of agony wrung from their dying victims.

Once incarcerated in the cellars of the 'Cheka, without means of communication with the outside world, without knowledge of the accusations against him, without counsel, without knowledge of the date of his trial, subject to the whims of the "revolutionary conscience" of his judges, the prisoner agonized in a living death. Seldom any record of his name, of his death or release was ever kept. All that was known, probably, was that some wagons or automobiles were seen leaving the 'Cheka building in the early morning. Thousands of citizens in every large city in the

thirty provinces of Russia, Kiev, Kharkoff, Odessa, the "House of Horrors," Poltava, in Moscow, and Petrograd, entered the cells of the 'Cheka to be seen no more.

To what indescribable tortures, prisoners, male and female, were subjected can only be imagined from the photographs of the dead bodies found in various places, especially at Kharkoff, after the Reds had evacuated the city, breasts cut, heads scalped, skin torn from the arms after being dipped in boiling water, bodies nearly cut in two having been beaten with iron rods, and nameless mutilation, the statement from a photographic work, *Le Bolchévism Illustre,* being:

> Sur certaines des photos en question on pourra voir les effets d'une operation purment demoniaque, dont les parties genitales des victimes furent l'objet; plusieurs medicins convoques apres l'exhumation ne purent definir le procede—mais avancerent a l'unanimite que cette operation, executee vraisemblablement par des tortionnaires chinois, devait etre le plus affreux supplice qu'un etre humain eut jamais endure.

The Red soldiers were not all savages. Thousands of them were in the army for the sake of their families' bread, or as an alternative to being shot. Those detachments who were attached to the 'Cheka revolted from such abominations as above mentioned, and

for that reason Letts and Chinese laborers who having been brought in during the World War were forced into the army took their places, which accounts for the reference to them in the French text.

It should be noted also that the leaders of the Red Terror were not all Russians nor were the Commissars and executioners of the 'Cheka. These last were principally Letts, Poles, Hungarians, and atheistic Jews who found in this chaos of society an opportunity to pay back some of the suffering that Russian pogroms had inflicted upon their race. It was stated on good authority in 1921 that of the 550 Commissars, or Chiefs of Committees, there were 30 Russians, 34 Letts, a few Hungarians and Poles, and 447 Jews. Of the 41 editors of the press at that time in Russia 40 were Jews. The majority of the Soviet government agents in Europe were Jews, Leo Trotsky (Lieb Braunstein), Zinoviev (Radomysky-Apfelbaum), Karl Radek (Sobelsohn), Henock Lilvimov (Finklestein), Adolph Joffe, Ganetsky, Bronsky, Gillersohn, Moroski and others distinguished for their Soviet activities.

Such a large number of Jews have occupied important places in the Soviet government throughout the provinces of Russia that the

impression has been created that the Revolution was the work of Jews and that the government now is carried on by Jews. There may be some grounds for such an opinion, but it is very probable that such statements are more likely an expression of anti-Semitism than of fact.

That Jews do fill important offices both in the government at Moscow and as financial or commercial representatives abroad is doubtless true, but this is probably because of their superior intelligence. It has always been so that as a race the Jewish people have excelled other races in Europe and Asia in intellectual and commercial pursuits, so that whatever page of history one turns, there is the face of a Jew, whether in Babylon, or Egypt, Persia, Greece, Rome, Germany, England, France, or the United States. The chief of the Soviet Foreign Office, Tcherin, however, is not a Jew but a Russian, nor was the head of the 'Cheka in the bloodiest period a Jew, but a Pole.

The agents of the 'Cheka, its spies, agents, and executioners were necessarily such characters as the nature of the institution demanded. Taken from the dregs of the criminal class; depraved by nature and made worse by long practice in crime; insensible to suffering and hardened to sympathy by habitual dab-

bling in blood, they struck terror throughout Russia. This was the purpose of the institution. Whenever they struck they struck hard, relentless, remorseless. Inhuman in malignity and malignant even in mercy, they created universal dread and called it patriotic approval. In his work *Two Years of Struggle on the Internal Front,* Moscow, 1920, M. Y. Latsis, one of the Commissars of the 'Cheka, says, "The Extraordinary Commission threw its best forces into the fight upon this manifestation (counter-revolution, sabotage) and is now working in various institutions. There is but one way to get rid of this pestilence—burn it out with a hot iron. And that is what the Extraordinary Commission is doing." How vigorously the Commission performed its task is seen in the report of M. Latsis that in 1918 and the early part of 1919, 8,309 persons were shot and that this number did not include thousands of others in other provinces. Whoever could, fled. Hundreds of thousands found refuge in the capitals of Europe, in Berlin, London, Paris, and crossed the sea to New York.

The number of professors, teachers, physicians, artists, writers, tradespeople, soldiers, working-men and peasants, hostages, who were murdered in the secret chambers of the

'Cheka, shot in batches, as five hundred were shot at one time for the attempted assassination of Lenin by Mlle. Kaplan, or dragged out a lingering death in the prisons, were so great that to enumerate them would possibly create doubt rather than belief in the enormities of the Extraordinary Commission.

It is not unusual to find sympathizers of Bolshevism expunging such figures with loud laughter at the impossibility of such numbers, by showing how many executions must have been inflicted every day in the year to reach such mathematics. The statements in the official papers of the Soviet government as quoted by Mr. Arthur Bullard, chief of the Department of the Division of Russian Affairs, in the Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, February 9, 1921, may be accepted, however, as containing at least a modicum of truth; and these show that in some months the number of executions were from 900 to 1,900. During October, 1920, the total number executed was 938.

It is quite possible also that a perusal of the German work *Pest in Russland, Der Bolshevismus, Seine Haupter, Handlanger und Opfer,* particularly page 22, by Alfred Rosenburg, Munich, 1922, might create the suspicion that, after all, there may be about as much

humor in such laughter as there is in a clown's grin at a funeral. That such figures are often exaggerated may be assumed, and that, since no exact records of arrests and executions were kept by the agents of the 'Cheka, it may be impossible to know the precise number of those murdered, nevertheless, the reports from official sources, as we have seen, may enable us to form some estimate.

In the interests of truth and justice it should be stated, however, that in this number, and in all numbers, were included all those adjudged guilty of any crime whether the accused had any trial or not—for fair trials could hardly be considered in every case—sabotage, theft, desertion, forgery of passports, illegal possession of food cards, secreting of arms, brigandage, which the government in its determination to rid the country of crime, and especially the cities, punished with the death penalty. But, on the other hand, it is difficult to arrive at the real truth even here, since every act could be construed as sabotage or theft or forgery against the government if so charged. Furthermore, not to belong to the proletariat was in itself direct proof that one was a bourgeoisie and therefore was guilty of counter-revolution.

Nevertheless, crime was rampant in Russia just as it was in every country after the war, when it seemed that the bonds of society were loosened and anarchy supplanted social order and security. And it might be further said, were it necessary, that the extreme rigor of the Soviet government in the suppression of vice should not be held against them as a political crime. In the United States civilization is not at its highest peak. Murders, robberies, lynchings, burnings, and hangings among a people supposed to be civilized, and in some sense Christian, are not so rare among us, nor do they create such alarm in the nation at large that one should lift hands in holy horror at the crimes, the butcheries, and the diabolisms of a government, whether right or wrong, which was fighting for its life, and, however vindictive, still believes that the only way to redeem the masses from industrial slavery is the utter destruction of society resting upon a capitalistic basis.

That the Russian people indorsed the 'Cheka or condoned its barbarities is as grave an error as to imagine that Southern people indorse lynchings and Negro burnings in Georgia or Texas, or the people of Illinois the pitiless cruelties inflicted upon helpless foreigners in the Illinois coal fields, or mob at-

tacks on Negroes in Chicago. The sad truth is that man, the cruelest of God's creatures, is a half-developed savage when primal instincts are aroused. He has yet millenniums of struggle through which he must pass before he can escape from himself, which he never can unless the power of the Omnipotent God liberates him from the law of the jungle which riots in his physical inheritance.

Several Provincial Soviets and People's Courts protested against the excesses of the 'Cheka. These Soviets issued decrees intending to curb the power of the 'Cheka, and instead of judicial whims and the "revolutionary conscience," instituted legal forms of procedure in the trial of prisoners. The Kharkoff Soviet decreed that "All persons and institutions making arrests are obliged to supply immediately the People's Commissary for justice and corresponding local institutions with detailed information on the cases of all persons arrested." Another Soviet decree declared that all investigation and other legal institutions without exception should deliver to the arrested person a definite accusation not later than forty-eight hours after his arrest. In many places there were popular outbursts of fury, as when Communist agents came to exact the tax on farm products, but these were

ruthlessly suppressed and the decrees ignored by the Commissars of the Commission.

The facts were that the government, conscious of its illegitimate character, having been overwhelmingly defeated in the election for the General Assembly when it overthrew the Kerensky government, and fearful of insurrections against it—up to 1921 there had been some three hundred uprisings—was compelled to rely upon such bands for its own protection and the enforcement of its decrees of confiscation, disfranchisement, and the suppression of counter-revolution. Above all law, the 'Cheka had the power of life or death over every man, woman, and child in Russia. In his speech before the second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin declared: "Toward certain elements of the counter-revolution any other policy, a policy not connected with violence and terror, is completely unthinkable. *No dictatorship of the proletariat is to be thought of without terror and violence against the bitter foes of the proletariat and the laboring masses*"—which meant, of course, the Soviet government, the enemies, which included all who did not maintain it in power. Again, in November, 1920, addressing the secretaries of Communistic societies in Moscow with reference to outside

enemies, he showed his dependence upon the Extraordinary Commission. "They will surely try to deceive us, to evade our laws, but for such purposes there exist our respective institutions, All-Russia Chresvichaika ('Cheka), Moscow Chresvichaika, Provincial Chresvichaika, etc., and we are sure we shall be victorious."

In his book referred to, M. Latsis, one of the Commissars of the 'Cheka, after describing the activities of that institution says, "It will now be seen what an important rôle the Extraordinary Commission plays in the suppression of counter-revolution. We can affirm with certainty that without it the Soviet power could not be maintained." Mr. Arthur Bullard, chief of the Division of Russian Affairs, testified on his personal knowledge before the Committee of the House of Representatives on Foreign Affairs, 1921, relative to this 'Cheka, as follows:

The Chairman: The supreme Executive Council appears to have exercised exclusive jurisdiction.

Mr. Bullard: You mean the Extraordinary Commission?

The Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Bullard: That was just beginning to function at the time I was in Russia and was not exercising with great force. Since then it has become the dominant instrument for the preserving of order and the safeguard of the Soviet regime. I do not think that we

would call it a judicial body; it is much more of an administrative organization; it has tremendously vague and extended powers. All of the proceedings were in secret, and it is not at all a judicial body.

The Chairman: It has both legislative and judicial powers?

Mr. Bullard: It has the power of sentences, life and death.

The Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Bullard: As to the figures I read to you before, there are three sorts of courts. There is this People's Court I have just discussed, and there is the Revolutionary Military Court, which is the highest court. Then there is at the top this Extraordinary Commission, for combating counter-revolution, speculation, and sabotage, often referred to as the "Chrezvichaika."

That is, there are the Extraordinary Commission, the Revolutionary Tribunals, and the People's Courts. Those two lower ones go through the form of public hearings, having arguments and discussions, and in that sense resemble our judicial organizations in that they are open and there is a chance for argument. The Extraordinary Commission, however, does not hold such hearings. Very often a man is condemned in his own absence and is not allowed to speak in his own behalf at all. That is the organization which is responsible for the largest number of executions.

These and other statements by responsible witnesses which are sustained by speeches of Soviet officials and the organs of the government, reveal facts which are usually suppressed or glossed over in artistic fashion in rosy narratives of conditions in Russia or in fragmentary reports of newspaper correspond-

ents who are not interested in religious affairs. Undeniable facts too glaring to be ignored are given certain twists or interpretations by propagandists who excuse conditions in Moscow or Petrograd on the ground that Russia is now getting on its feet, as if success justified crime. The experiences through which the people have passed, the hunger, the desolation and sickness, the collapse of industry and the paralyzing wretchedness of life, are all covered over by the comforting assurance that the worst is over, or that these and all other calamities are the evil results of Tsarism. But propaganda is ingenious enough never to refer to the destructive policies of the Bolsheviks in their bloody efforts to impose with the aid of the 'Cheka their Communistic theories upon the helpless masses.

In the meantime the question which arises at every attempt to justify the usurpers of the Russian government elected by the people remains unanswered, Why this government, why this rule of the minority over the majority? Nor has it been shown why Lenin and his conspirators should have forced their economic theories upon the Russian people and should have been compelled to establish 'Chekas all over the land, that is, in thirty provinces, imprisoning and murdering hun-

dreds of thousands who resisted their authority, if their government was the choice of the people.

Another witness before the same Committee was a Socialist. He was born in Russia, had lived there thirty years, and had served in the army in Moscow. He came to the United States in 1890 and was living in Chicago. His wife had been a worker in the Socialist Party for eighteen years. In 1919 they both went to Russia to study conditions. He attended the Internationale, met John Reed, whom he knew well, Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman; knew Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev. When he first arrived in Moscow, being vouched for by these American deportees, he was met with soldiers and a band of music and escorted to a hotel in the Tsar's automobile. He traveled from town to town gathering information, until he was suddenly arrested as an agitator and kept in jail for four months, his wife dying in prison in an hunger strike. In answer to questions of the Committee his testimony showing the power of the 'Cheka is:

Mr. Dickinson: What percentage of the Russian people are converts to that form of government or are of that line of thinking?

Mr. Schwartz: That is a good question, and I am glad to answer it. There are 125,000,000 people in Russia living under a Communistic form of government.

This is a statement made by Lenin in Congress on July 19, 1920. He said, "We have in the Communistic party about 600,000 members," and I say, in answer to your question, that there are not more than ten thousand Communists. Now, you would like to know why it is that they claim 600,000 instead of 10,000 Communists. The answer is that these Communists give them two pounds of bread and many other things that are attached to membership, as I understand it. Now, as you know, hunger is a terrible thing. If a man is hungry and is dying, and there comes a man with a proposition to give him two pounds of bread instead of one pound, he will join the Communist party in order to get it. In that way they get what they call palasky members. "Palasky" means bread and meat, and that is what they mean by palasky members. They join them, and there are about 590,000 palasky members and 10,000 of these are real active members. Now, you may ask why do they go in. They force them to do it through the measures that they have or through their decrees, but in reality there are very few Communists.

Mr. Dickinson: What you want the Committee to believe is that all the men owning property, all the business interests, and all the peasants on their own land are controlled by 10,000 Communists, or that 10,000 Communists are able to impose a regime of that kind upon 125,000,000 people?

Mr. Schwartz: That is true. It is almost impossible of belief, and I did not believe it until I went to Moscow myself.

Mr. Dickinson: Did you find that to be the fact?

Mr. Schwartz: Yes, sir. They have established what they call the Chresvichaika Commission, which is the Extraordinary Commission, and of that Extraordinary Commission Lenin himself is afraid. They deal with life. There is no open trial and no attorney. You are not present, but you are found guilty and shot. That is the way they control the government. Lenin

says that they must have this Chresvichaika Commission.

Thus a government within a government but acknowledging no authority above its own, in touch with the army, armed with machines, the 'Cheka could be as dangerous to the government as it was a terror to the people.

It was to such a power that the Church and its ministers from the Patriarch down through all ranks to the village priests were subjected, its activities and institutions of every character being liable to sudden investigation as a suspected counter-revolutionary body. The spies and agents of the 'Cheka wriggled themselves into the Church. They formed "cells," that is, inveigled eavesdroppers, among the priests wherever a traitor could be placed, whose business was to note down conversations, political expressions, incidental remarks, thereby delving into and becoming familiar with the intimate life and relationships of bishops and priests who were supposed to influence the attitude of the people toward the government.

Not being included in the category of those entitled by law to receive bread tickets, and thereby compelled to starve or beg, or by illicit means to purchase enough to keep alive, it was not remarkable that some priests out of a large

number should surrender to the pangs of hunger, when they were deprived of their living, especially during the famine, and, unknown to their brethren, enter the secret service of the 'Cheka. The village priests, or popes, were mostly married, and they had no means of procuring bread for their wives and children. Many who were thus induced to betray their brothers would for themselves have preferred death to dishonor, but seeing their wives and little ones dying of starvation, the temptation was often too strong for them to resist, and while we cannot condone the crime we may drop the tears of God over the frailties of human nature.

But while there were some among the lower clergy who formed "cells," there were others not thus situated who for various reasons aligned themselves on the side of the government. These traitors denounced their fellow bishops and priests as counter-revolutionaires and secretly delivered them to the 'Cheka. It is not likely that in the days to come such characters will be forgotten. It is much more likely that, instead of being enrolled among the saints and martyrs of Russia's dark days, they will hang forever gibbeted on the pages of history!

There were others of another class who

felt that the time had come when the Church should be purged of the evils that had corrupted its life. Among such there were doubtless many sincere and holy men, humble priests, more bent on sanctity than on preferment, and had they not been misled by crafty strategists into the belief that the heads of the Church were opposed to reform and by their opposition to the government had brought upon the Church the sufferings it endured, they might have purified the Church and spiritualized the people.

But as it has often happened in the history of the Church, there were those who in the universal chaos, both in Church and state, saw their opportunity. With the subtle Machiavellian craft of the Church politician, than whom there is none more insidious and none more criminal, these past masters in the fine arts of pious chicanery found their way with the aid of better men to the highest places in the Church. It was this coterie of rebellious ecclesiastics that the Patriarch Tikhon denounced, and scornfully ridiculed as seeking episcopal honors and emoluments in order that they might indulge their appetites and luxuriate in worldly pleasures while calling their new found freedom "reforming the Church." Thus divisions and fatal lines of

cleavage rent the Church. No priest dare trust another implicitly, for everywhere the spies of the 'Cheka were stealthily at work, perhaps in the very sanctuary officiating at the altar of God, or among the domestics in the house. Distrust, fear, a nameless feeling of approaching calamity brooded over the lives of men and darkened their days. No one knew who would be the next to be arrested.

Nevertheless, despite the long-drawn agony of the years there were comparatively few, after all, who delivered their souls to Diabolus compared to the number of stalwart men of God who scorned the wiles of the tempter and yielded to the officers of the 'Cheka. Brave men who believed in God defied the atheism of Moscow and, like martyrs of Christ, gladly went to their doom.

Twenty-eight bishops and more than a thousand priests suffered the death penalty.

CHAPTER IV

TERROR

It is interesting to observe how often the currents of history have been changed by the sudden emergence of a single individual who becomes the embodiment of his time, or of unforeseen forces issuing from the depth. Such extraordinary events have created entirely different results from those which would probably have been produced had the natural laws of political or social development not been interfered with. The famous saying of Pascal that had Cleopatra's nose been longer or shorter, the first verse of the second chapter of Saint Luke's Gospel would never have been written, and the history of the Roman Empire would have been different, is one of many illustrations of what might have been the history of the world.

Had the purposes of the provisional government which immediately followed the abdication of the emperor been realized, a constitutional government would have been the natural sequence of the Revolution. But from the overthrow by the Bolsheviks of that govern-

ment and the phantom Constituent Assembly which had been called to draft a Constitution, the state of the country went from bad to worse. Never had a brave and noble people endured such suffering. All the evils which afflict mankind—wars, famine, pestilence—seemed to have pitched their tents to stay on the soil of Russia. Millions of producers had been swallowed up in the World War. Russia's losses were estimated at about seven millions of men either killed or crippled for life.

The armies of Kolchack, Denikine, Wrangel, Pilsudsky, and others in abortive attempts to overthrow the Bolsheviks had left behind them scenes of desolation and unutterable misery. The land had been nationalized, and the peasants in gratitude for the same had fought with the Red Armies or supported the government in its policies, but they had not considered that the products of the land were nationalized also. For the feeding of the armies on the various fronts and the scarcity of food in the cities, the application of Communistic principles of a fixed allowance had robbed the farmers of all surplus of grain beyond what was absolutely necessary for the support of their families. As a result the farmers refused to sow more than they were compelled to for their own use. But the food tax was en-

forced upon what they did have and universal want destroyed the morale of the people. Industry was paralyzed. Hundreds of thousands of ragged, helpless, hungry humans wandered aimlessly from village to village thinking other sections better off than their own. The vast area of Russia is not an economic unit, and good crops in one province is no guarantee against starvation in another. Moreover, the railway system, never adequate, being only as to mileage about one ninth that of the United States per one hundred thousand population, was completely demoralized and the transportation of food became extremely difficult.

Insurrections broke out in many places only to be swamped in blood by the Letts and Chinese in the employ of the government. The Lenin and Trotsky regime, being attacked on all sides as the betrayers of Russia, and outlawed by the Allied governments, struck back without mercy. All classes without regard to age or sex who were suspected of opposition to the government felt its sudden and remorseless might. A Reign of Terror surpassing in its atrocities the hideous nightmare of the French Revolution at its worst drove thousands of the educated classes—physicians, scientists, artists, skilled workmen, and thou-

sands of others, all who could escape—into foreign countries. In the frenzy of the hour so-called Tribunals of Justice were established. Government spies—brutal, repulsive dregs of society—ferreted out possible enemies; and the 'Cheka engulfed thousands of victims whose only crime was that they belonged to the bourgeoisie. The State Department at Washington, apprised of these conditions, announced on July 10, 1919, that eighteen thousand persons were seized and held in prison as hostages.

The demoralizing effects of the Terror evoked a protest from the civilized world. On September 3, 1918, the diplomats of the neutral governments issued a united note to the Bolshevik Commissary Zinoviev against these outrages. The governments themselves also addressed Tcherin, the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, a vigorous protest in which they declared that "such deeds of terrorization and force on the part of men professing a desire to realize human happiness are incomprehensible. They call forth the indignation of the whole civilized world, which now has knowledge of the events in Petrograd. The diplomatic corps has found it necessary to announce its shocked feelings to the people's Commissary, M. Zinoviev. It protests with

the utmost energy against the arbitrary deeds that are occurring every day."

The reply of the Soviet government was defiant and insulting:

> When the representatives of the neutral nations threaten us with the indignation of the entire civilized world, and protest against the Red Terror in the name of humanity, we respectfully call their attention to the fact that they were not sent to Russia to defend the principles of humanity, but to preserve the interests of the capitalist state. We would advise them, further, not to threaten us with the indignant horror of the civilized world, but to tremble before the fury of the masses who are arising against a civilization that has thrust humanity into the unspeakable misery of endless slaughter. . . . The Russian working class will crush without mercy the counter-revolutionary clique that is trying to lay the noose around the neck of the Russian working class with the help of foreign capital and the Russian bourgeoisie.

Norman Armour, Secretary of the United States Embassy in Russia, who returned to the United States on November 5, was quoted as saying: "Words are inadequate to describe what I saw in Russia during the reign of terror, misery, want, and wholesale murder. The people are starving and can get no hearing, much less redress, from the blood-crazed Bolsheviki." Volumes could be filled with accounts of the horrible butcheries under Bolshevik rule.

During this carnival of anarchy the Church endured severe trials. The atheism of the governmental leaders and the organized committees for "Combating Religion" gave encouragement to the Communists to manifest their antagonism to the Church and its institutions. On February 14, 1919, the Archbishop of Canterbury published in London a letter from the President of the Supreme Administration of the Orthodox Church in Russia, the Archbishop of Omsk, in which it was stated that

Having seized supreme power in Russia in 1917, the Maximalists proceeded to destroy not only the cultivated classes of society but have also swept away religion itself, the representatives of the Church, and religious monuments venerated by all.

The Kremlin Cathedral of Moscow and those in the towns of Yaroslav and Simferopol have been sacked and many churches have been defiled. Historical sacristies as well as the famous libraries of the Patriarchs of Moscow and Petrograd have been pillaged. Vladimir, Metropolitan of Kiev, twenty bishops, and hundreds of priests have been assassinated. Before killing them the Bolsheviki cut off the limbs of their victims, some of whom were buried alive. Religious processions followed by great masses of people at Petrograd, Toulaa, Kharkov, and Eoligalitch were fired upon.

Wherever the Bolsheviki are in power the Christian Church is persecuted with even greater ferocity than in the first three centuries of the Christian era. Nuns are being violated, women made common property, and license and the lowest passions are rampant. One sees

everywhere death, misery, and famine. The population is utterly cast down and subjected to most terrifying experiences. Some are purified by their sufferings, but others succumb.

Only in Siberia and the region of the Ural Mountains, where the Bolsheviki have been expelled, is the existence of the civil and religious population protected under the ægis of law and order.

It is easy to imagine—and this is the usual method of defending the Soviets—that in such a summary of crimes the Archbishop of Omsk had indulged in wild exaggerations or possibly in pious fictions, a product of uncontrollable antipathy to the Bolsheviki against whom anything would be believed. But it is not easy to imagine that a man in his position would risk his life at home and his reputation in England by sending such a letter to the English archbishop if stated facts were not susceptible of proof. He must have known that the primate of England in intimate contact, officially and personally, with the British government, could through its Intelligence Department, and through other channels of information, have easily ascertained the actual truth in every instance. It does not, therefore, serve demagogic defenders of Bolshevism to call everybody a liar whom they cannot refute, nor will they be permitted to answer such charges as are made by responsi-

ble men in high station by wholesale denial. Rich men do not steal, unless they become insane, and men of honor do not lie.

In many other districts the fury of the Bolsheviks was no less horrible. Their thirst for blood was insatiable. At Dorpat two hundred victims were huddled together; a selection was made, and these driven into the cellar of a building were massacred, their skulls being crushed with axes and the butts of guns. The victims were so disfigured that it was difficult to identify them, but among the many were Archbishop Platon, who was present at the All-Russian Conclave in 1917; the priest Michel Blewie, of the Russian Orthodox Church; Nicholas Beshantitzki, priest of the Orthodox Church; and the Rev. Pastor Schwartz, of the Lutheran Church, whose head and arms had been severed from his body. Everywhere the massacre of priests of all Churches, of which this is only one example, tells the story of the Church in those days of Terror.

A psychological study of the workings of the human mind leads one to reflect how often, despite the inhibitions of conscience, our alignments with men and affairs are affected by the necessities of our partisan interests. What infamous act of tyranny is there, what high

crime that was ever committed, what iniquity of men or nations, of governments or churches that ever disgraced the pages of history, that did not find its apologist in some historian, philosopher, or fool? A Gibbon exercises his marvelous skill and fascinating pomposity of phrase to deplore the antagonism of the early Christians to the state and to extol the leniency and patriotism of their murderers. A Froude will sanctify the lechery of a king by the requirements of dynasty, and mock the sufferings of one queen in order to extenuate the cruelties of another.

Defenders of the persecutors of religion in Russia are not lacking. They are of all types and of colorful variety. They are found among those newspapers and magazines which specialize in radicalism and think themselves progressive. They are plentiful among parlor-Bolsheviks, who amuse themselves with matches in a powder house, who lift eyes of holy horror at the deportation of "undesirables" and sow the seeds of death and destruction at home under the protection of the Constitution. The glutton of the lime-light afflicted with insatiable hunger for publicity, not otherwise obtainable, here finds his opportunity, as does the weather-beaten politician out of a job and looking for an issue.

But they are not all of this questionable quality. Among them are those who love fair play, those who from sincere conviction that justice should be given the worst of men, bravely insist that truth is not always on the side of him who makes the loudest clamor. Nevertheless, in daily paper and magazine, on the lecture platform, and even in the pulpit, apologists for Sovietism extenuate the crimes of the Communists, whose goal is world revolution and the destruction of religion, and minimize the patriotism and moral bravery of those who stand for God and country.

Against the testimony of governments whose agents are everywhere in Russia, and upon whose reports those governments depend for the truthfulness and accuracy of their charges against the Soviet regime, and against the protest of all the religious bodies in Europe and America, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the heads of the Presbyterian, Congregational, Methodist, Baptist denominations in England, the pastors of the Protestant churches in France and various organizations in the United States and Canada, these vindicators of Bolshevism, those whose only source of information is the interpreter who guides them, or the officials who

feed them, declare that there was no religious persecution in Russia!

If bishops and archbishops or humble priests are arrested and shot, tortured or immured in the cells of the 'Cheka, from whose bourne there is seldom return, it was not because of their religion, but because of their resistance to the government! These victims deliberately violated the laws governing confiscation of church property or had secret correspondence with the enemy!

It is quite possible that cases of this kind could be discovered upon judicial investigation, for it does not always certainly follow that every victim who was put to death was executed solely on account of his religion. He may have been killed on account of both his religion and his politics, or only for his resistance to the government. It is quite probable also that in many instances out of the one thousand seven hundred and twenty-six priests officially reported as put to death by the Soviets there may have been those who died both for their faith and their opposition to Soviet rule.

It seems, however, to have escaped the apologists of Bolshevism that if their defense has any validity, it would follow that there never was any persecution of religion in the entire

history of Christianity. For, from the day that the Lord Jesus was crucified on Calvary the perpetrators of such crimes have always justified their deeds on the ground of "political necessity." Caiaphas furnished that argument: "It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people and that the whole nation perish not." The persecution of the early Christians, it could be argued, was not because of their religion, as the Letters of Pliny to the Emperor Trajan show, but because of their enmity to the state. Chief-Priest Caiaphas and Procurator Pilate, Nero and Diocletian, Decius and Domitian—monsters of iniquity—were all patriots, according to this logic, and should be exonerated from the unjust charge of religious persecution. Such a charge spoils their reputation! The Inquisition in Spain, the butcheries in the Netherlands, the Huguenot massacres in France, the hangings and burnings in England, the Claverhouse atrocities in Scotland and the intolerance of the Puritans in New England were all justifiable on the ground of "political necessity."

Directly contrary, however, to assertions of visiting tourists is the evidence of eye-witnesses. These have lived through typical scenes of horror in various parts of Russia,

but all give the same story. Their knowledge of the Russian language, their character and standing and their acquaintance with eminent persons done to death give importance to their testimony. In the London Times of December 3, 1919, is the testimony of the Rev. R. Courtier-Forster, formerly British chaplain at Odessa and the Black Sea Ports:

Do English people really imagine that the published accounts of the appalling atrocities and brutal tyranny of the Bolshevist rule in Russia are an exaggeration? Before God I wish I could believe they are not true to the actual facts. Could I but find them untrue, I would speak for the Bolshevists from end to end of England. Unhappily, I have spent nearly a year in Soviet Russia, and was in the hapless country over seven years before that.

Omitting the details of cruelty and deaths visited upon the people of Odessa, the history of religious persecution in Russia demands that the testimony of a living witness be recorded with a view to a correct understanding of the situation in that unhappy land:

It is repeatedly said: "Bolshevism is solely concerned with economics. It has nothing to do with religion." This is absolutely untrue. The horrors of heathen Rome and the episodes of the Coliseum have been brilliantly imitated and excelled by the Reds in Russia.

The first objective of Bolshevism is the complete elimination of every form of Christianity from the world and the substitution of a world-wide atheism.

Of course this will be denied, as everything else which is inconvenient is denied. The fact remains. The ideals of Christianity are diametrically opposed to the brutal practices of Bolshevism, therefore Christianity is recognized as its most dangerous foe, and is treated accordingly.

It was the martyrdom of the two Metropolitans and the assassination of so many bishops and the killing of various Christian ministers of religion, regardless of denomination or school of thought, that proved the undoing of the Scourge (newspaper). Russian Orthodox clergy, Protestant Lutheran pastors, Roman Catholic priests were tortured and done to death with the same light-hearted indiscrimination in the name of toleration and freedom. Then it was that the Scourge, seeing the last remnants of liberty ground under the heel of a tyranny more brutal in its methods than a mediæval torture chamber, published another full-page cartoon representing Moses descending from the burning mount, bringing in his arms the tables of the Ten Commandments to humanity, and being stoned to death by a mob of workmen's and soldiers' deputies.

The persecution developed with unexampled ferocity. In the monastery near Kotlass, all the monks and the prior were shot. In Perm Archbishop Andronik was buried alive. This ghastly fate caused such horror among the cowed and terror-stricken peasants that the heroic Vassili, Archbishop of Tchernigov, greatly daring, made the journey to Moscow to make representations respecting the tragedy of Archbishop Andronik. It was a splendid venture gloriously made, but the archbishop could look for no mercy from the blood-soaked tyrants who have made "Freedom of Mind" a byword for the most despotic tyranny the world has ever seen. The history of the journey will live in the annals of the Russian Church forever. Archbishop Vassili shared the martyrdom of his brother. With his two companions he was hacked to pieces.

When the history of the Bolshevist persecution to eradicate Christianity from Russia comes to be written, the Christian world will stand aghast at the crimes committed in the attempt to stamp out the love of Christ from the heart of the Russian nation.

The year 1921–22 was a period of intense suffering. The famine, like devouring locusts that leave green fields bare, had eaten in the heart of the grain region and threatened to destroy the population and make Russia desert. The Soviet government feverishly engaged in fomenting trouble in foreign countries—Afghanistan, Persia, Egypt, England, the United States—and dreaming of world-revolution, had overlooked the stealthy approach of their destroyer.

At this juncture the Patriarch Tikhon made an appeal to the nations for help. The Archbishop of Canterbury published the appeal in the English papers. The press of America aroused the people to the seriousness of the disaster, and, ever responsive to the needs of humanity, the people, the government, the Red Cross, the American Relief Associations, under the direction of Secretary Hoover, furnished foods and medicines to alleviate the sufferings of the present and, if possible, prevent greater evils in the near future. It would seem from this that the Patriarch was not

indifferent to the famine, as the Soviet cartoons in Moscow had represented him.

But Tikhon was a marked man. The Soviet government, by its cowardly negotiations with the Germans for a separate peace, had lost prestige. As head of the Church, which had lost millions of property and people, he had already denounced the treachery of Lenin and his confederates, who by the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk had surrendered vast areas of Russia to the Germans, in whose pay it was openly charged Lenin was, even after he had been two years premier of the state.

By this treaty Russia lost 301,000 square miles of territory, 56,000,000 inhabitants, and 13,350 miles of railways, besides mines, factories, banks, and other sources of wealth and revenue. Never had a conqueror exacted such indemnity, and never had complacent traitors so readily surrendered to the demands of the conqueror. In all the cities, towns, and villages of this region there were churches and cathedrals, monasteries, schools and various other religious institutions which, with the millions of inhabitants, were turned over to the Germans. The Church in Courland, Esthonia, and other surrendered provinces was dissevered from the church life in Russia.

Possibly there are those who would look

with complacency upon such an astounding calamity as one of the unavoidable consequences of war and think that silent acquiescence in the inevitable on the part of the Patriarch would have been more politic than useless denunciation. Such worldly-wise philosophy is, no doubt, a comfortable substitute for duty and self-sacrifice; and had it been carefully practiced by champions of justice and freedom in every age, the world might have been spared those excruciating examples of heroic devotion to truth, which may be admirable in the abstract but unendurable in experience. A comfortable apartment and a bright fire, or the sweet light of the sun, is much to be preferred to a damp cell or a tall gallows.

Like Mercier of Belgium, who in the hours of his country's agony defied the savagery and rapacity of the invader, Tikhon denounced the coterie that had dismembered Russia and had subjected millions of his people to a foreign power. He was not forgotten.

The government had defeated the counter-revolutionary armies one by one. It now turned its attention to the Church as the one remaining enemy that resisted its authority.

Ostensibly to enable the government to purchase food for the people it was decreed that

the churches throughout Russia should collect and turn over to the state all treasures of silver and gold, ornaments, jewels, precious stones, and such valuable utensils used in divine service as could be spared and turned into money. This was not a sacrilegious demand. There was nothing in the canon law or in the history of the Church to forbid such surrenders of sacred property. Prior to this decree the Patriarch himself had offered these treasures to the American Relief Association as security for a loan to be applied to the purchase of food.

The history of the Church furnished numerous instances of such benevolences. The historian Lecky relates that Saint Ambrose sold the rich ornaments of Milan to rescue captives taken by the Goths. The Bishop of Carthage, Deogratias, had acted in similar manner to ransom prisoners taken by the Romans. The great Augustine, Gregory the Great, Hilary of Arles, Remi, Exuperius of Toulouse, all melted down or sold church utensils for the freedom of prisoners. And if it should be said that these were of the Western Church, the Eastern Church also could have readily presented equal examples of Christian charity—Cyprian of Carthage, Epiphanius Avitus, Eligius, who sacrificed his entire fortune;

Peter Teleonarius, Serapion, and many others.

Moreover, the Patriarch offered to sell these treasures provided the Church was permitted to purchase and distribute the food. But this, in view of the government, would have enhanced the prestige of the Church in public esteem and diminished that of the government. The government, therefore, refused to accept the offer of the Patriarch. For similar reason the government demanded that the food sent by the United States government should be distributed to the people by the Soviets. The American government, however, had no intention of furnishing bread for the Red Army, to which much of the supplies would have found their way, nor for the Soviets to assume credit with the people by giving them bread, and Washington, therefore, became as adamant in its refusal.

It is clearly evident, then, that there must have been some other reason for the Patriarch's refusal to obey the orders of the government than a desire to preserve the treasures of the Church. That reason, which was also probably entertained by the American Relief Association, was a deep-seated distrust of the moral character and the intentions of the Moscow leaders. Who were these men, these ad-

venturers? They were not the men who had overthrown the Tsarist government. They had fought no battle; they had had no part in the Revolution. They were the men who by the aid of disloyal troops had usurped the authority of the provisional government and dispersed the General Assembly, which was the only hope for a constitutional government Russia had ever had. They were not lawful representatives of the people. No one had elected them. They were usurpers and destroyers who had determined to impose by military force an economic theory upon the Russian people at a time when the people were unprepared for any theory, being unarmed, war-weary, disorganized, and at the mercy of Germany. Out of 120,000,000 people their party—the Communist—could not claim more than 600,000 and their only support was the army, without which their leaders, Lenin, Trotsky, Radek, Zinoviev, would be fugitives in other lands. They were atheistic Jews for the most part who had assumed Russian names to conceal their identity. Trotsky's real name is Bronstein; Steklov's, Nahamkes; Kamenev's, Rosenfeld; Zinoviev's, Apfelbaum.

Many of these leaders had criminal records. A former attorney-general in Petrograd, now living in New York, whose duties afforded him

special opportunity to obtain official information concerning alleged criminals, in an open letter to a United States Senator who had favored recognition of Soviet Russia, asked, "How can any decent government recognize or extend diplomatic courtesies to a political faction composed of ex-convicts, murderers, international swindlers, and thieves?" He then proceeds to give real names and the crimes attached. One was a German spy once in charge of the Communist propaganda in Western Europe and known to have participated in the robbery of the post office in Tiflis on June 13, 1906. Another, appointed by the Soviet to govern the so-called Far Eastern Republic, had been an innkeeper of the lowest type and of most shady reputation. Another was openly accused by the Soviets of having misappropriated large sums belonging to the state. Another, very prominent as a Commissar and a member with a notorious persecutor, alias Finklestein, of the Internationale, was an avowed thief, and another belonging to the 'Cheka, had been a burglar and was twice sentenced; as was another for twelve years at hard labor for outraging a girl thirteen years of age.

History, it is true, is not built upon accusations, and in default of trial and convic-

tion guilt cannot be established. But it is not to be assumed, for all that, that these men were unknown to the authorities of the Church, as their characters were not unknown to police officials in their conflict with these individuals in the government at Moscow.

Furthermore, the government at Moscow is avowedly atheistic and opposed on principle to every form of religion. Zinoviev, as chairman of the Executive Committee of the Third Internationale and member of the government, in addressing a delegation of English and Swedish Protestants, June 17, 1923, against anti-religious propaganda, declared, "Our program is based on scientific materialism, which includes unconditionally the necessity of propagating atheism." Stepanoff, Commissar of the "League of Communist Youth" for "combating religion," declares: "We will demonstrate that no church can live, liberal or otherwise. No religion for us today. We will use church dissension for a complete and decisive separation of the masses from every cult, religion and church."

Undoubtedly, there are some excellent men in the Soviet government. They are not all criminals, nor are they all blasphemers. There must be, indeed, some very able men among them. Lenin was no mediocrity, but

one of the master minds of the twentieth century; nor is Krassin, nor Zinoviev. And when the organizing ability of Trotsky in building up such an army as Russia has, and the victories he won in the face of almost unsurmountable difficulties, especially in Petrograd, are justly considered, as must also his diplomatic efforts, it must be conceded that he is not inferior to some much-mentioned designated diplomats, nor to many generals in the World War who won distinction with much less evidence of military ability.

Nor is anything lost in conceding also that among these Communists there are some who out of self-respect, or from a sense of justice, or perhaps restrained by a lingering regard for a faith they have abandoned, refused to go the lengths of extremists and impose their unbelief by brute force on those opposed to them. Sane thinking does not permit us to affirm that every atheist is necessarily a bad man, and, therefore, to be made the victim of intolerance. To assert that all atheists, or agnostics who do not believe in the existence of a personal God, or who affirm that if God does exist we can know nothing of his nature, are thieves, pickpockets and all-round wicked men, capable of all evil, is a monstrous assertion. No one could possibly think this of

Thomas Huxley, Leslie Stephen, John Morley, Harriet Martineau in England, and others like these in France and in the United States. Nor is it any evidence either of sanity or of piety to denounce those who in all honesty of purpose refuse to accept traditional belief, much of which has been handed down to us by men of narrow horizons who, if they were living to-day, would doubtless change many of their theories for which in their day they sent men to the dungeon or the stake. Nothing can be more antagonistic to the principles of the gospel of Christ than an intolerant spirit, and few things are more deserving of reprobation than an appeal to religious prejudice in order to gratify hate, to bolster up a weak cause, or to compensate by abuse for the lack of a better argument.

But the atheism of Moscow is not a passive atheism. It is not a personal belief, or negation of belief, resting upon scientific or philosophical grounds, but is a vindictive, aggressive atheism which does not recognize the fact of religion or its right to exist. It regards religion as an hypnotic superstition to be everywhere abolished as the enemy of the state and the progress of civilization. As expressed by Bucharin, the teacher of Communism, Zinoviev, Stepanoff, and their colleagues in the

government, the atheism of Communism is a God-defying type. To it there is nothing sacred. A cruel, blatant, destructive diabolism, it experiences its deepest satisfaction in dreaming of effacing every vestige of religion from the earth, and in eradicating the name of God from the memory of men.

That the character of these Communists controlling the government was well known to the Patriarch and Church authorities long before the decree for the sequestration of Church valuables was published is evident from the fact that in 1919 the Patriarch had anathematized the commissars of the government and written them a letter enumerating their crimes, some of which, however, were not crimes such as compelling clergymen to dig trenches. In that remonstrance he declared, "Not a day passes but the most monstrous calumnies against the Church of God, angry blasphemy and sacrilege appear in your press" (evidently referring to their subsidized "Without God," and the official organs *Pravda* and *Izvestia*). "You have laid your hands upon the inheritance of the Church, gathered together by generations of the faithful, and have not hesitated to violate their last will and testament. You have closed monasteries and chapels for no cause or reason

whatsoever. You have closed the entrance to the Moscow Kremlin—that sanctuary of the people. You have dispersed church and diocesan meetings, interfered with the internal affairs of the Orthodox Church. You removed sacred images from the schools and, by forbidding religious teaching, you deprive the children of the spiritual nourishment so indispensable to a Christian upbringing!"

Nor is it altogether certain that the Soviet government was sincere in its published purpose of devoting the treasures of the Church to the needs of the people. Not all the people held Soviet honesty above suspicion. A correspondent of long residence in Russia and vouched for by the editor of the Atlantic Monthly writes, "Such a persistent campaign had been carried on by the government through the press (which is a state monopoly) that the people were in great measure undecided what to do. They were, on the whole, willing to strip their churches to relieve the famine districts; but most of these were convinced that a great proportion would be used for foreign propaganda, or find its way into the commissar's private pockets."

In May, 1923, Nicholas Bukharin, editor of the Soviet organ *Pravda,* reported to the committee of the Communist party and the

Præsidium of the Third Internationale the results of his inquiries concerning the money spent in foreign propaganda. The report he presented suggests what little ground there was for the confidence of the people or the clergy that the treasures of the Church would be expended in relief of famine. The whole sum, for which no vouchers or other documents were presented by well-known Soviet agents and officials, amounted to $13,750,000, and this while the people were starving by tens of thousands in every part of Russia, and the United States through the Red Cross and the A. R. A. was straining every nerve to bring relief. In the investigation by the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, begun February 11, 1919, of Bolshevik activities in the United States, the judge advocate presented in evidence a Soviet government order for 2,000,000 roubles for propaganda purposes. The order read:

For the appropriation of 2,000,000 roubles for the requirements of the revolutionary internationalist movement.

Whereas, The Soviet authority stands on the ground of the principles of the international solidarity of the proletariat and the brotherhood of the workers of all countries; and

Whereas, The struggle against the war and imperialism can lead to complete victory only if conducted on an international scale.

The Council of People's Commissaries considers it absolutely necessary to take every possible means, including expenditure of money, for the assistance of the Left Internationalist Wing of the workingman movement in all countries, whether these countries are at war or in alliance with Russia or are maintaining a neutral position.

To this end the Council of People's Commissaries orders the appropriation for the requirements of the revolutionary international movement, to be put at the disposal of the foreign representatives of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, of 2,000,000 roubles.

LENIN,
TROTSKY,
GOUCH-BRUEVICH,
GARBUNOV.

And in what luxury, in what ostentatious prodigality of seeming wealth these representatives of the starving millions of Russia resided in sumptuous dwellings and offices in the capitals of Europe. In nearly every capital city—London, Paris, Berlin—they lived like ambassadors of the great powers and under cover of promoting trade attempted through their secret agents to destroy the very governments that gave them hospitality. Russia was starving. Hundreds of thousands were dying for a bit of bread. Disease of every character—typhus, dysentery, cholera, spotted fever—was stalking through the land. The 'Cheka was grinding out its daily grist of corpses whose blood bespattered the walls of

its dungeons or cellars. But millions of money could be spent by the Soviet government in foreign countries, including the United States, to foster revolution, to demolish in irretrievable ruin, even through blood and fire, the long results of time in the civilization of those countries, leaving nothing but smoking ruins, desolation, and death to denote the glory of Bolshevism and the triumph of atheism.

The Patriarch refused to surrender the wealth of the Church to such a government. He was arrested. The fury of the Soviets broke loose. Soldiers accompanied government agents in their raids upon the churches. Bloodshed added tragedy to many scenes of exploitation, and everywhere priests were arrested and shot, among them Benjamin, the Archbishop of Petrograd, who was denounced by a Siberian priest, Vedensky, who figured later in the so-called Conclave of 1923, and who also violently denounced the Patriarch Tikhon as worthy of death for his resistance to the decrees of the government.

The number of priests put to death was officially reported as 1,276,181, others were sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment. The total value of the treasures taken from churches, cathedrals, synagogues, and mosques in all Russia fell far below what the Com-

munists expected. After all the gold and silver utensils and ornaments were melted in bullion and the coins counted the whole amounted to probably 100,000,000 roubles, although it should be said that the New York *Journal of Commerce,* May 16, 1922, placed the amount at 314,000,000 gold roubles. Of this amount the government reported for famine relief twenty per cent. The remaining eighty per cent was reserved to combat famine conditions in 1922-23.

In this conflict between Church and state the Church suffered severely. It could not be otherwise, nor is it easy offhand to determine which was in the right. But it is certain that those writers, few though they be, to the honor of Protestantism, who condemn the Patriarch and his clergy for their obstinate resistance to the decrees of Lenin, Zinoviev, Trotsky, Kaminev, and others, fail to do him justice. It is inconsistent and not creditable, that, in order to defend the Soviet government, or their private interpretation of events in Russia, they find it necessary to attack the Patriarch as the cause of all the woes that befell the Church. As I write these lines there arises before me the great painting, "The Siege of Jerusalem," by Kaulbach, in the Art Museum in Berlin. Multitudes upon multi-

tudes crowd the canvas, driven by the conqueror in their hurried march to exile in Babylon. Amid clouds of dust and falling ruins, Jeremiah the prophet sits dumb, gazing with unfathomable grief into vacancy, the elders, leaders, and nobles of the people in chains turning upon him in wildest rage, pouring out upon him their curses and execrations as the cause of all their woe.

So it has ever been. Those who would save the people, the people crucify. And those who condemn Tikhon, if they have any sense of consistency, must also condemn with him and for a similar reason a host of others—John Knox and Hooper and Ridley and Latimer. (Hugh Latimer, who when the flames were licking his body at the stake, cried out to his fellow martyr, "Be of good cheer, Master Ridley. We shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England as I trust shall never be put out.") They dared to resist the demands of tyranny.

Certainly, every fanatic is not a martyr, except to himself, and not every rebel is an apostle of freedom. Sometimes bad men enmeshed in politics have died for a good cause, and good men have failed and paid the penalty. Nevertheless, the cross is the throne of the Christ. It is ever the symbol of victory

though its victims fail. It was the great leaders of Nonconformity in England, the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, who resisted the power of Parliament to enforce the Act of Uniformity; the intolerance of King James I, who would "harry them out of the land," that made Protestant influence paramount in America. It was to these that the late Troeltsch, eminent among German thinkers of the present time, ascribes modern religious freedom and progress in the English-thinking world, and not to the national church of England, the church of the Reformation. Had there been no Tikhons in that day, there would have been no New England, nor Plymouth Rock; no Puritans, nor Pilgrim Fathers, and other names would have been inscribed on Massachusetts' scroll of fame than those of the Brewsters and Bradfords, John Robinson, Winthrops and Mathers, who on New England's rock-bound coast lifted psalms to wintry skies.

On the other side, if we consider the matter from a purely legal view, there can be little doubt that since an act may be morally right but legally wrong, and legally right but morally wrong, the government, even though an evil thing, was legally in the right. The law sequestrating church property may have been

a bad law, but it was the law. It was clear and explicit to the minutest detail. It was made by competent authority, at least for the time being, by a *de facto* government; and although it worked hardship upon the Church it was nevertheless to be obeyed as any other law.

This the Patriarch knew. Therefore, in defying the law, no matter how impious it was, nor what the character of the law makers may have been, and by his example to priests and people encouraging them to like resistance, the Patriarch Tikhon was undoubtedly guilty. This he also knew. It was, therefore, for him to decide as every man of integrity and conscience in similar case, whether Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Gentile, must decide for himself, whether to obey the law or take the consequence. Tikhon took the consequence.

CHAPTER V

CONCLAVE

The General Council which had been called by the "Living-Church" Congress of August, 1922, convened, after several postponements, at Moscow, April 20, 1923. It had been widely advertised, and great expectations were awakened. Some enthusiastic admirers of the spectacular, little acquainted with the history of councils or ignorant of the religious situation in Russia, and knowing nothing either of the events which led up to the Council or of the prelates who had directed and controlled the movement, looked upon the Council as a marvelous event. It was declared to be "one of the greatest events of modern history," the beginning of "a great Reformation in Russia comparable to the Reformation in England."

Whether such exaggerations were for the purpose of attributing to the Council a character it did not possess, or for purpose of magnifying the importance of the imaginary reformation yet to be, matters little. What is of consequence, as indicating the narrow extent

of such people's knowledge of what was really going on in Europe at the time, was the organization of the Czecho-Slovakian Church, an event apparently unheard of to such writers on religious affairs in Europe. This extraordinary movement was certainly a greater event because of its religious effect on Central Europe than this Council. Of the 7,000,000 members of the Church of Rome, in Bohemia, Silesia and Moravia, 800,000 had severed their connection with that Church and had united under the leadership of their priests in a new church, the National Czecho Church, aligning itself with the Eastern Orthodox Church. Not since the Reformation in the sixteenth century had there been such a revolt from Rome. To have declared, then, this Russian Convention to be one of the greatest events of the century in comparison with this Czech movement is evidence of a tropical luxuriance of imagination rather than of sound judgment.

Compared with the Great Sobor of the All-Russia Orthodox Church of 1917, in which were represented the best types of the religious life of Russia, this Council was in many respects an inferior body. It lacked personnel. The ablest bishops, the most renowned scholars, the most cultured leaders of the Church were either with the martyred dead

or in exile. Of the leaders in the Council, Antonine, Krassnitsky, Eudokim, and Vedensky, it may be said without loss of Christian charity what Bismarck said of the court-preacher Stöcker in Berlin, that "He was too much of a politician to be a good preacher, and too much of a preacher to be a good politician." These men had usurped authority; they had taken possession, contrary to the canons of their Church, of episcopal sees; they had expelled lawful bishops and deprived of their rights many other spiritual leaders who had resisted their demands. They were regarded by the people as a whole as the protégés of the Soviet government, the beneficiaries of the martyred blood of their fellow priests.

In order to understand clearly the events which led up to the calling of this Council, the methods employed, the relations existing between the government and the organizers of the Living Church, the methods adopted to secure the kind of delegates desired, it is necessary to review the circumstances in detail, for such facts set forth the true character of the so-called reformation in the Russian Church.

The inside history of the movement not known up to this time and which could be obtained only from sources intimately ac-

quainted with the facts, is of the profoundest importance. Had these facts been known, some blunders in dealing with the so-called Living Church might have been avoided by those Church leaders who rely too implicitly upon the statements of others, who, not knowing the Russian language, were themselves dependent upon the good faith of their informants, already committed to the program of the Soviet Church leaders. Those churches which declined the invitation of the reformists may now congratulate themselves on having escaped unenviable publicity.

The arrest of the Patriarch in May, 1922, was evidently the signal for the revolution in the Church. On the night of the 13th of May a group of clergymen who were said to be agents of the High Political Administration visited the Patriarch and proposed that, since he was under arrest and the Church was without a head, he should transfer the administration of the Church to one of the two bishops who had accompanied them, Antonine or Leonid. This the Patriarch refused to do. He expressed willingness, however, to transmit his authority either to the Metropolitan Bishop Benjamin of Petrograd, or to the Metropolitan Agathangelos whom he had chosen previously should necessity arise. This was

agreed to. But Benjamin had been executed; the choice then fell upon Agathangelos. The Patriarch was assured that Kalinin, the president of the Central Executive Committee (for the government is made up of committees, the president of each constituting the Cabinet), would place no obstacle in the way of Agathangelos coming to Moscow and taking charge of the ecclesiastical administration.

Having received proofs of these assurances, the Patriarch addressed two letters—one to Kalinin and the other to Agathangelos, informing him of the situation and appointing him his temporary substitute. It seems that the plan of the reforming group was, as after events reveal, in accepting the aged Agathangelos to induce him to comply with their purposes, for when their aims were presented to him he refused to accept any of their proposals. The conclusion of that chapter was that, for some reason, and very conveniently for the group, Agathangelos was arrested and thrown into prison. The Church, therefore, was left without visible head.

Following the arrest of the Metropolitan Agathangelos, which, of course, was known to the group always in close relation to the government, this group immediately seized upon the administration of the Church, giving as

their authority for so doing their appointment by the Patriarch, and called themselves the "Living Church." These ecclesiastics very well knew that while there were Metropolitan bishops in the Church the Patriarch could, according to canonical law and custom, no more pass over their heads and transmit his authority in the Administration to bishops and priests than a bishop could transfer his functions to a deacon. It was supposed, however, by multitudes in the Church, who in the chaotic condition of affairs did not look into the matter, that in the general confusion extraordinary measures were required for emergencies.

The Soviet government, which had authority in so important a matter, since all the churches and their properties had been nationalized, seeing that this usurpation would play into their hands against the Church, permitted the seizure. The leaders of the new movement were friendly to the government and could force the Church into the same relation, whereas under the Patriarch or any of his adherents the Church would still continue the enemy of the state.

It is affirmed by those who know that the government was not only cognizant of all the transactions of these Church leaders, but

actually directed them. These leaders, in order to have the protection of the government, had promised their support to the High Political Administration, or G. P. U., and to act in the future according to its commands. Thus the Church again was to become the tool of the state. That it was so under the Tsarist government (for which it had grievously paid, although under an autocratic government it was absolutely helpless, as the efforts of the reformer Nikon to achieve independence had demonstrated) is one of the highly colored charges brought against the Church by the defenders of Sovietism; but such critics are pathetically dumb in their skillful omissions, or exceedingly careful to soft-pedal the abject servitude of the so-called "Living Church" to the behests of the Soviet regime.

These leaders of the pretended reformation —for no such reformation as evangelical Protestants think of under that term was ever intended—were enabled to capture the government of the Church, not because it was the desire of the people or of the clergy, for such authority could not be exercised without proper authority. This is evident from the joyous return of the priests and the people to the Patriarch Tikhon on his release from prison, when the conspiracy was made known. But

because of the reign of terror then sweeping over the country the Church people had no means of knowing the real course of events except the false articles published in the government's organs, such as *Izvestia,* the *Pravda,* or Stepanoff's Living Church, the organ of the Communists. In the *Izvestia* these leaders published a signed statement that the Patriarch had transferred his authority to them as a High Ecclesiastical Administration with Bishop Antonine as its head.

This, on the testimony of the Patriarch published to the whole world on his release, was, of course, a false statement. What the Patriarch had ordained was that in the event of the destruction of the Administration, as anything might happen from the atheists at Moscow, each diocese should govern itself independently till the persecution ceased. Should the diocesan administration be abolished, then each parish should keep the fires of religion burning as best it could and independently govern itself. But the Orthodox people had no way of correcting the false impression made by Bishop Antonine and his supporters, nor the false statements made by the enemies of the Church in the government press. To oppose the protégés of the government was to oppose the government and expose oneself

to the danger of a sudden visit from the agents of the *Tcheka.*

Then, it is easy to see how the ranks of the reformers in time of chaos and distress could be greatly enlarged. The Revolution in Russia, like the Revolution in France, had a terribly demoralizing effect upon all classes. As it was with the clergy to a large extent in France so it was in Russia. The days of Jehovah are always days of burning. Many of the clergy, out of desire to belong to a group upheld by the government, or for the purpose of avoiding persecution of themselves and their families, were ready to join the "Living Church," laying aside for the present the morality involved. Other influences played their part in this terrible drama. But perhaps the worst of all was the paralyzing apathy of the clergy as a whole. Worn down by the excitement and danger and the persecution of five long years, moral fatigue created indifference and gave unresisted opportunity for the ambitious leaders of the movement to do as they willed.

The methods of these leaders were of a peculiarly skillful political character. Protected by government agents there was placed in each town a committee of three persons, members of the "Living Church." Each group

would present to the bishop a list of demands, all tending to the recognition of the High Ecclesiastical Administration of the Living-Church group. If the bishop refused to comply, he was displaced by the Administration or arrested upon some charge against the government. By such means more than eighty-four bishops were deprived of their dioceses or sent to prison, so that the number of canonically consecrated bishops in the "Living Church" is very small.

Archbishop Theodosiy, of Kief, after his escape from the Red soldiers, stated that in order to obtain a majority in the approaching Conclave, at the end of March, 1923, the representative of the Living Church who was appointed by the Moscow Ecclesiastical Administration to the post of Metropolitan of Ukrania arrived in Kief and sent a circular letter to all the bishops inviting them to submit to his authority. The reply was a unanimous refusal. But the result of this reply was that the local Soviet authorities arrested Doctor Mikhail, the legitimate Metropolitan of Ukrania, with four other bishops and a number of priests.

It was not a free Council. No free elections had been held. It was first of all decided by the group leaders, in order to exclude persons

who might possibly question the authority of the Council, and to be sure of a majority in any event, that no one should be elected who had been censured by the High Administration or sentenced by the civil courts. In that way all bishops and priests who had suffered for the faith under the Soviet government would be excluded, which meant that the Conclave would be for those only who had agreed to the seizure of the Church.

The Conclave, then, was composed (1) of bishops named by the High Administration; (2) the members of the dioceses authorized by the Administration; (3) twenty-five persons designated by the same. This should constitute a pretty good majority for the reformists. Out of 476 members of the Council, 189 were of the above category, which shows that agents of the government were also present; the remaining 287 had to be elected.

Many parishes refused to hold any election. In some instances nearly whole dioceses, such as Turkestan and Poltara, boycotted the Council and would hold no election. In cities like Savator, Nizhny-Novgorod, and even Moscow, few elections were held. Some Orthodox communities took part in the election. Others took part hoping to elect a group that would oppose the acts of the Council. These,

however, were doomed to disappointment. For, fearing the possibility of the elections going wrong, or of sending elements that might disturb the plans of the leaders, the elections were held under the supervision of the G. P. U. and measures often used by the Bolsheviks, such as arrests and imprisonment of opposers to the High Administration, were well understood to have been provided.

Nevertheless, sixty-six persons who belonged to no party were elected. These, actuated by a sense of justice, formed a group demanding a trial of the High Ecclesiastical Administration itself, a public hearing of the whole history of the seizure of the Church Administration by these clergy, and in case the Patriarch should be brought to trial, that the case be heard in open council and in the presence of the Patriarch. That group arrived nowhere. It was very soon disposed of. They were in the grip of a merciless power and did not know it.

The mode of eliminating them was very simple. A questionnaire was presented by a committee to each member of the group who should state in writing (1) His attitude toward the Soviet government. (2) His opinion concerning the Patriarch Tikhon, especially his prohibition of seizing Church treas-

ures and consecrated articles. (3) His opinion on depriving the Patriarch of his office. (4) His opinion on the Great Council of 1917. (5) His opinion concerning the Letter of the Patriarch in 1918 anathematizing the Bolsheviks. (6) What party did he belong to? (7) If he belonged to the reforming party, was he ever sentenced for political offenses against the Soviet government, or for resisting the sequestration of Church property?

Members of the group who would be conscientious in their answers would, of course, be immediately arrested as self-confessed enemies of the government. The group, therefore, thought it safer to be discreet than honored by sitting in the Council.

The sessions of the Conclave were held in the Theological Seminary of the Orthodox Church. The number of delegates in attendance was 476 over against 1,072 in the Great Council of 1917. The Patriarch was in prison. Metropolitan Peter of Siberia was elected president, Bishop Antonine, vice-president. Invitations had been extended to the Christian bodies to send representatives, but with one exception there was no response. The churches in Russia, numerous and influential, such as the Old Believers, numbering about 2,000,000; the Lutherans, 300,000; Reformed,

85,000; the Stundists, 500,000; the Mennonites, 66,000; and the Anglicans, 5,000, sent no representatives.

One authority of high Christian character, who was for many years in close personal touch with Christian workers in Russia, says:

> What lodges conviction with me personally that this is not a spiritual and therefore permanent movement, is that I find it wholly repudiated by all the Russian Christians in whom during five years of contact in Russia I have come to have spiritual confidence. I have not found a single exception to this rule, and these persons belong to a wide range in affiliation and intellectual outlook. I get the same report from the representatives of our American Protestant churches.

In April, 1923, the Archdiocesan Council of the North American Archdiocese of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church met in New York and denied the legitimacy of the Council. The resolution is lengthy but illuminating. Its value is that it presents the Russian situation from the viewpoint of Russian prelates in this country. These ministers have a more intimate acquaintance with the facts than it is possible for one to have who is not a Russian and is not personally related to the events or questions involved:

> *Whereas*, The legal Church Authorities must be deemed to be only such authorities as have been constituted by virtue of the church laws now in force;
>
> *Whereas*, In this respect the church laws now in

force, and which are obligatory upon everybody under the penalty of excommunication, are the enactments of the All-Russian Ecclesiastical Sobor of 1917–18;

Whereas, The Supreme Church Authority constituted by that Sobor was the only Patriarch—the head of the Church Administration—and the Sacred Synod and Supreme Church Council acting under the Patriarch's presidency, the enactments of the same Sobor stating who temporarily shall occupy the Patriarch's office in the event that the Patriarch's throne be vacant or the Patriarch be prevented from fulfilling his duties;

Whereas, As is well known, His Holiness, the Patriarch, has been imprisoned since the spring of 1922, and has been prevented from fulfilling his duties; his *locum tenens*, Most Eminent Agathangelos, has been also arrested, and the Sacred Synod and the Supreme Church Council prevented from acting and dispersed by the Soviet authorities, some of their members being executed, some imprisoned, and all the remainder prevented from meeting and functioning;

Whereas, With the assistance, and under the auspices of the Soviet authorities, an unlawful and self-appointed organization came into existence in Moscow, assuming to itself the title of "The Supreme Church Administration" and proclaiming itself the supreme body in the Administration of the Church;

Whereas, That organization not only is illegal and all its activities are null and void, but all its members have excluded themselves from the Russian Orthodox Church by daring to disregard the enactments of the All-Russian Sobor of 1917–18, by sinfully aiding in the destruction of the lawful Church Authorities and by arbitrarily proclaiming themselves possessed of such authority;

Whereas, By the activities of the said so-called "Supreme Church Administration" the lawful local Church Authorities have also been destroyed, since nearly all Bishops lawfully appointed to the Dioceses, who did not

recognize that self-appointed organization (and, as was to be expected, these numbered nearly all Russian Bishops, with some insignificant and regretable exceptions), were expelled by violence from their chairs and subjected to various persecutions and penalties, including torture and death, and thereupon their chairs were given to such persons as felt no shame in accepting their appointments and even their very episcopal orders from the above said false organization in open violation of their ecclesiastical duty;

Whereas, Under the political conditions at present prevailing in Russia, no freedom of thought, speech, meeting, or election exists, and no free elections of delegates to a Sobor are possible, and, therefore, any election of delegates to the said "Sobor" can be but an unlawful and sacrilegious comedy purported to gather together the enemies of the Church and the henchmen of the anti-ecclesiastical organization which has usurped the Church Authority under the assumed name of the "Supreme Church Administration";

Whereas, Therefore, this lawless gathering which is about to be convoked in Moscow by this so-called "Supreme Church Administration" under the falsely assumed name of the "Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church": First: is being convoked not by the legal Church Authorities, but by persons who unlawfully and sinfully have usurped the Church Authority; Second: is being assembled without any participation therein by the lawful Bishops of the Russian Church, instead of whom such persons only will participate at this "Sobor" as have obtained their chairs by violence, deceit, or enticement, and, therefore, under the rules of the Holy Canons are excommunicated; and, Third: will be composed, not of freely elected representatives of parishes and dioceses, but, as a result of an artificial selection, by henchmen of a group which associated itself with the Soviet government and is trying to cause upheaval in the Church and aid in its destruction;

Whereas, One of the purposes of the Moscow Pseudo-Sobor is the trial of the Patriarch Tikhon for his activities in protecting the Russian Church from attacks by the Soviet authorities;

Whereas, The so-called "Supreme Church Administration" and the Pseudo-Sobor definitely and clearly have disclosed their criminal and anti-ecclesiastical character by their intention to try the innocent sufferer, our Holy Father, Tikhon, whose name and person are devotedly revered by the whole Orthodox Church, and who not only is not guilty of any fault toward the Church, but is most deserving of praise because of his dignified, manful, and fearless defense of our Church and our Holy Creed from their vicious enemies;

Whereas, The sacrilegious trial of the Patriarch has the single purpose of assisting the Soviet authorities in subjecting him to further indignities, tortures, and possibly to death itself, and so to degrade in the eyes of the Russian people the high office of the Patriarch, and the Russian Orthodox Church itself;

Be It Resolved:

1. That it shall be deemed that the so-called "Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church" to be convoked and organized in open violation of Russian Church Law, as enacted by the last lawful Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1917–18, the authority of which has been unquestionably recognized by the Russian Orthodox Church itself, as well as by all Eastern Patriarchs and autonomous churches;

2. That the purposes of this Pseudo-Sobor intended to destroy the legal organization of the Russian Church, to submit His Holiness, the Patriarch, to a derisive and sacrilegious trial, and to surrender him definitely into the hands of his foes, are illegal, criminal, and sinful;

3. That all acts and resolutions of such Pseudo-Sobor shall be considered devoid of any canonical force and value;

4. That, therefore, the resolutions of such Pseudo-

Sobor shall not be recognized, or put into execution within the North American Archdiocese;

5. That, should the lawful Patriarch of Russia, His Holiness, Tikhon, be indicted or dethroned, or in any way subjected to any illegal persecutions by such Moscow Pseudo-Sobor, or should the election of a new Patriarch be attempted or the establishment of a new form of government of the Russian Church be attempted, all such acts shall be deemed null and void;

6. That no representatives or emissaries of such so-called "Supreme Church Administration" which exists now in Russia, or of any such church administration which may be created by the Moscow Pseudo-Sobor, and no persons who recognize the authority of such a "Church Administration," or who may accept the resolutions of the Moscow Pseudo-Sobor, shall be recognized by or admitted into the Archdiocese, no matter in what capacity or under what name they may come;

7. That it shall be proclaimed publicly that the North American Archdiocese remains and will remain in full obedience to the lawful Church Authorities as represented by His Holiness the Patriarch Tikhon, and the ecclesiastical institutions or officials acting on the basis of the resolutions of the Sobor of 1917–18, and of the epistle of the Patriarch's *locum tenens*, his Eminence the Metropolitan Agathangelos.

8. That it shall be proclaimed publicly that should Our Lord be pleased to recall to Him our Patriarch Tikhon, or should the Holy Father definitely and freely decide to depose the burden of the Patriarchal authority, then, and in that event, the North American Archdiocese, in confirmation of its bonds with the lawful Orthodox Church, will recognize no arbitrary authorities or organizations which might exist within Russia, but will exist as an independent part of the common body of the Church until a legal Church Authority has been reestablished in Russia and recognized by all Eastern Churches;

9. That, in painful realization of our impotence to prevent the crime which is now being perpetrated in Russia, a protest be made to the Eastern Patriarchs, the representatives of other Christian Churches, and to the whole world against the violence to which the Russian Orthodox Church and its Patriarch are being subjected by the Soviet authorities and the Soviet "Living Church";

10. That the above resolutions, through the superintendents of the Districts, be announced to all parishes and the latter be required within the shortest possible time to confirm in writing their unfaltering allegiance to the lawful Orthodox Church and to accept these resolutions unreservedly for guidance and execution.

It would seem, therefore, from this official declaration of those who know Russia and the Russian Church best, that the Council held at Moscow was not of such a character as could command the highest respect or be regarded as truly representative of the Russian Church. The vicar-bishops of the Russian Church in the United States and Canada all repudiate it, and this judgment is shared by the representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church, Archbishop Alexander representing the Patriarch of Constantinople, Archbishop Panteli-mion representative of the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

It was designated by bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States as a "trumped-up Council" and with-

out legitimate authority. That its character was known, and because it was known was rejected by Russian Orthodox Churches in the United States, one hundred and thirty-two in number, and also by one hundred and fifty Greek Orthodox Churches, the bishop of which rejected the Council and its acts as being contrary to the laws and practices of the Eastern Church, would seem to be sufficient evidence that the legitimacy of the Council was not so incontrovertible as those who were misled or duped by its leaders were willing to believe. Every revolt endeavors to justify itself.

From this conclusion it also appears that those who have supposed that through it they were encouraging reform in Russia or those who had dealings with it in any way, had, in fact, no contact with the Russian Church people at all, but only with self-appointed groups of clergy who, as the evidence proves, represented neither the church nor the people.

It is of historical importance also to observe that this Declaration of Representatives of the Orthodox Church in America, denying the validity of the Moscow Conclave and repudiating the "Living-Church" group as true and lawful bishops and priests of the Church, was not the utterance of a faction. These American-Russian bishops and priests were the

recognized officials in charge of Orthodox congregations and Episcopal sees in the United States and Canada before the Bolshevik persecution broke out in Russia; before the "Living-Church" group had seized the government of the Church in Russia and had usurped the authority of the Patriarch. It must be observed also that what this Declaration affirms was confirmed later in a Convention of representatives of the whole Orthodox Russian Church in America held at Detroit in April, 1924.

The events in the Russian Church necessitating this Convention which declared a total repudiation of the "Living-Church" Conclave and an avowal of independent autonomy were such that if the facts were as stated in the Declaration, and they were well known to be irrefutable, there could be no other alternative than the erection of the Orthodox Russian Church in America into a separate and distinct Organization, absolutely independent of and separate from the government of the "Living-Church" regime in Moscow.

The "Living-Church" reformists, having usurped authority in the Church and having abolished the Patriarchate and deprived the Patriarch Tikhon of all his functions, reached out across the seas and claimed authority over

the Russian Churches in the United States. Deprived of state allowance, and deriving no revenue from any source but the gifts of the people who refused to bestow any gifts, it would undoubtedly be a master-stroke of ecclesiastical ambition if these reformists could succeed in such an enterprise. The wealth of the Church in America, with the contributions of three million of its members, the amount increasing with increase of members and prosperity of those members, would compensate for the loss of appropriations from the government and from the churches at home, and would make the life of the Russian ecclesiastic one of independent comfort and ease. It was an alluring prospect. But to realize the dream was not so easy. The bishops and membership of the Church in the United States were not Bolshevik. They were fully informed of the attempted so-called reformation led by Antonine, Krassnitsky, Vedensky, Eudokim, and their assistants who were committed to the Moscow Soviet government. They also understood the methods employed by these men in their seizure of Church authority and of the opposition these men and their proposed reformation had encountered on the part of the Orthodox people in Russia. Therefore, as seen, they pronounced their determina-

tion not to recognize the Conclave, its leaders or its decrees.

This opposition of the American bishops and priests seems to have disconcerted the plans of the reformists in Russia. It was a staggering disappointment. In turn, therefore, asserting their assumption to be the governing body of the Church, they sent to the United States for a priest named Kedrovsky, who had declared his sympathy with the Soviet Church. On his arrival in Moscow without consulting the Churches in America they consecrated him bishop over all the Russian Churches in the United States, thus displacing arbitrarily the Metropolitan Platon, who had espoused the cause of the Patriarch Tikhon. On the return of Kedrovsky to New York as Metropolitan bishop he immediately demanded possession of the Church property. This demand was denied, whereupon lawsuits were instituted to compel the Metropolitan Platon and bishops to deliver the property, valued at several millions, and all authority in the Church over to him with the result that without waiting for decisions of the courts, a General Convention of the representatives of the Orthodox Russian Church in America was called to determine the future of the Church.

The Convention met in April, 1924. It was

composed of over one hundred and sixty representatives, the Bishops Stephan, of Pittsburgh; Theophilis, of Chicago; Appollinarius, of Detroit; and a special envoy of the Archbishop Aftimius of the Eastern section of the Orthodox Church. The report of the Convention as given the public press April 11 was that

> Many million dollars' worth of church property throughout America and more than 3,000,000 church members were affected. It dealt with the alleged attempt of the "Living-Church" leaders to gain control of the Russian Church in America and announced the decision of the American branch to continue as a self-governing body "until a lawful All-Russian Church Convention be convoked in Russia!"

The reasons for the Convention and the Resolution adopted as reported by the legal counsel for the Church were that

> The General Convention of the Russian Orthodox Church in America was convoked in order to discuss the situation created by the existence in Russia of a religious sect, which is styling itself "The Russian Orthodox Church" and trying to usurp the control over that Church in Russia as well as in America; the appearance in this country of an emissary of that sect, one John Kedrovsky, calling himself the Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Russian Church in America; the litigation stirred up by him against the Church, the attempts to submit parish properties to a receivership, and other vital questions facing the Russian Church here.

The Convention resolved that, in view of troubled conditions in Russia, which began disastrously to bear upon the American branch of the Russian Orthodox Church, this branch shall henceforth exist as a self-governing body until a lawful All Russian Church Convention (Sobor) be convoked in Russia under conditions assuring the entire freedom of its discussions and decisions, and an understanding be reached at that Sobor concerning the eventual fate of the Russian-American Orthodox Church. As to the organization of such self-governing Church it was decided that she should be governed by a Ruling Bishop together with a Synod of Bishops and a Council of elected clergymen and laymen, and controlled by periodical general Conventions.

In view of rumors that the Patriarch Tikhon had issued an order removing Metropolitan Platon from his office of Head and Ruling Bishop of the American Church, the Convention resolved that under Canons and Russian Church law such an order would be obviously unlawful.

The Convention further resolved that the "Living Church" is but a dissenting unorthodox sect, having no standing in the Russian or Universal Orthodox Church, and that John Kedrovsky was properly excommunicated from the Orthodox Church by a joint decision of bishops belonging to Russian, Constantinople, and Jerusalem Orthodox Churches, and cannot claim either the bishop's office nor even membership in this Church.

Some rumors were spread by enemies of the Russian Orthodox Church maintaining that the actual purpose of the Convention was to secede from the Orthodox Church and become independent, under the auspices of, and even merge with, the Episcopal Church. Such rumors, the Convention declared, were without any foundation whatever, and obviously malignant.

This decision of the Russian authorities in

the United States leaves no doubt as to the character of the "Living-Church" Conclave as interpreted by Russians themselves, who might be presumed to understand Russian affairs better than others ignorant of the history, the spirit and purposes of the Russian Church. The decision of three millions of Church members with the bishops and archbishops of the Church in America that the leaders of the "Living-Church" movement are not lawful representatives of the Church in Russia and have no authority in the Church in America and that the movement itself is schismatic cannot be ignored. It would seem to constitute sufficient evidence in the forum of reason that in the judgment of these millions the whole affair planned and executed by those Moscow leaders was not a reformation but a rebellion against lawfully constituted authorities, a seizure of place and authority in imitation of the seizure of political power by Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, and other leaders of Bolshevism.

The resolutions adopted by the Archdiocesan Council of North America, April 2, 1923, together with the resolutions adopted by this General Convention of the whole Church, at Detroit, April, 1924, evidently places the status of the "Living Church" and the char-

acter of the movement beyond the realm of controversy.

After the formal opening in the Cathedral of Our Saviour, in Moscow, the Council devoted some time to the consideration of reforms. These had, with the exception of the marriage of priests, been initiated by the Great Sobor of 1917, but which it appears it was impossible to execute because of the sudden seizure of political power by the Bolsheviks, the consequent conflict between the state and the Church, and the reformist movement in the Church.

Many members of the Conclave, no doubt, were truly religious men, sincere and earnest in their purpose to reform the Church, which was greatly needed, for, manifestly, it would be unjust to charge all these men with other than Christian motives. Even the leaders of the revolt, though wholy wrong in their methods and in their alliances with Communistic principles, should not be regarded as renegades to the Christian faith, as some of their opponents charge with more zeal than charity. Such sweeping condemnation would be unchristian, incapable of proof and unnecessary.

Little was done, however, to purge the Church of those evils of which the various reformist groups complained. An attempt

was made to abolish all sacred relics which the more radical demanded, because they fostered superstition. The resolution failed, however, through the efforts of Bishop Antonine, the leader of the "Living Church," who defended their veneration on the ground that the bodies of the saints can by supernatural influence be preserved, because, said he, "saintly lives of ascetics undoubtedly influence also their bodies." Evidently, on reflection, the Conclave thought so too, and the majority fell in with this very scientific and modern idea. But while the resolution failed, its fate was not accepted with composure. A compromise was effected, however, which retained relic-worship provided the relics were kept in open view and not concealed in caskets. So much for reformation of the Russian Church by these reformers.

The Council lifted the ban on the marriage of the clergy. Formerly the "Black Clergy," from which the bishops and higher officials were taken, were prohibited from marrying, and the "White Clergy," or village priests, or popes, were permitted to marry only once. The Council made no revision of the doctrines or theology of the Church. These remain the same as when formulated by Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, in 1820, which is in har-

mony, with the exception of Purgatory, the doctrine of Indulgence and the *Filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed, with that of the Roman Catholic Church. Whole groups of former Orthodox have gone over to the Roman Church since the split, without any change of confession being considered necessary. Nor were any changes made in the Service Book or in the forms of worship. But a large majority voted to abolish monasteries which did not adjust themselves to the Soviet order.

A serious debate concerning autonomy for the Ukranian Church threatened the solidarity of the Council. That church, in order to harmonize itself with the Ukranian Republic, expressed a desire for independence. To this the Council consented. But the Siberian delegates threatened, should this be allowed, to withdraw and organize a church of their own. There was much debate, long and heated. The Council finally reversed its decision, whereupon the Ukranian delegates withdrew in a body.

The chief business of the Council seems to have been an official expression of loyalty to the Soviet government by adopting its policies and Communistic principles and the unfrocking of the Patriarch. The scene was doubtless interesting and the minds of the

assembled bishops must have been agitated as under the spell of Vedensky's fiery eloquence they committed the Church to the gospel of Communism, and the degradation of the Patriarch of All-Russia without trial. Mounting the platform under a picture of Christ without a frame, and gazing at a picture of Lenin and other Communistic leaders on the opposite wall, Vedensky declared that Lenin was dear to the Church; that "Marxism is materialistic, atheistic, and wrong in its philosophy of life, but it remains true that the Soviet government, dominated by the thinking of Karl Marx, is the only government that is striving actually to enthrone the principles of Christ."

That Communism was ever a Christian doctrine, especially that the principles of Karl Marx are the principles of Christ, will be interesting news to Christian scholars. Even the abortive attempt of the Jerusalem church to supply the needs of the poor on a sort of Communistic basis was in no sense Communism, since the members of that Church who had property or goods still held ownership, which Communism does not permit, as the capital source from which food and clothing were derived. Nor is there any word of Jesus which can be distorted in support of Com-

munism. Responsibility for the methods by which capital or riches may be obtained and the right use of the same can never be a Communistic responsibility. Moral responsibility is not distributable. Guilt is always personal. No Dives can escape personal guilt for his neglect by shifting responsibility for Lazarus on to the crowd.

The degradation of the Patriarch from his office, from his episcopal rights and from the priesthood was next in order. This was a drastic undertaking. Bishop Antonine led the way. He was followed by Vedensky, who by every art of oratory inflamed the imagination and beclouded the judgment of the bishops before him. The effect of his appeal was not long in doubt, as preunderstandings seldom are. Tikhon was unfrocked. He was degraded from the ministry. The Patriarchate was abolished.

The following resolution defining the positions, political, ecclesiastical, and economic, of the new church was adopted:

Having listened to the report of Archpriest A. Vedensky, the All-Russian Council of the Orthodox Church witnesses before the Church and all mankind that the whole world has now become divided into two classes—capitalistic exploiters and the proletariat, with whose toil and blood the capitalistic world builds its prosperity. In all the world there is but one Soviet State of

Russia which has gone forth to give battle to this social evil. Christians cannot remain indifferent onlookers in this battle. The Council proclaims capitalism to be a deadly sin, and the fight against the same to be sacred to a Christian. In the Soviet power the Council sees the leader of the world toward fraternity, equality, and peace among the nations. The Council denounces the international and Russian counter-revolution, and it condemns it with all its religious and moral authority.

The Council calls upon every honest Christian citizen of Russia to go forth to battle, in united front, under the guidance of the Soviet Government against the world-evil of social iniquity.

The Holy Council of the Orthodox Church of 1923, having deliberated on the condition of the Church during the time of the Revolution, has resolved:

1. Beginning with the summer of 1917, responsible leaders of the Church assumed a definitely counter-revolutionary point of view. The Church must re-establish the unity of Tsarist Russia—such was the motto according to which the Church commenced to live (having been so closely bound up with Tsarism prior to the Revolution). The Council of 1917, composed largely of the representatives of the reactionary clergy, influenced nobility, property owners, and members of reactionary political parties, became at the very outset a definitely political, counter-revolutionary gathering which merely covered all these actions with the name of Christ, the Redeemer. The Council fought against the Revolution. It did not recognize even the provisional government, and after October this struggle assumed a perfectly incredible extent.

After the meeting of the Council Patriarch Tikhon continued his counter-revolutionary activity. He became a leader and standard-bearer of all opponents of the Soviet power. He drove the Church into the counter-revolutionary struggle.

The Holy Council of the Orthodox Church of 1923

condemns the counter-revolutionary struggle and its methods, which are the methods of man-hatred. Especially does the Council of 1923 deplore the anathematization of the Soviet power and of all who recognize it. The Council declares this anathematization TO HAVE NO FORCE.

2. The Council of 1923 condemns all those who have followed this path and led others to follow them. And this applies, first of all, to the responsible leader of our entire Church life, Patriarch Tikhon. Whereas Patriarch Tikhon served the counter-revolution instead of really serving Christ, and—since he is the one who is supposed to conduct properly the affairs of the Church—thus led into error the broad masses of the Church, the Council regards Tikhon as a denier of the true testament of Christ and as betrayer of the Church. And, on the ground of the canons of the Church, it hereby declares him to be DEPRIVED OF HIS RANK AND MONKHOOD, AND RELEGATED TO HIS ORIGINAL CIVIL CONDITION.

Hereafter Patriarch Tikhon shall be known as the layman, Basil Belavin.

3. The workers of the reformist church movement have severed all connection with the counter-revolution, and they have earned for that the disapprobation of all reactionary churchmen. The Holy Council of 1923 proclaims that all these interdictory measures have no force whatever. On the contrary, the Council blesses the courage of these men and their devotion to the Church, which they have torn from the hands of the counter-revolution and are restoring to the only Christ, the Redeemer.

4. The Holy Council urges all churchmen to abandon all attempts to use the Church for temporal political schemes, for the Church belongs to God and must serve only Him. There ought to be no place in the Church for the counter-revolution. The Soviet power is not the persecutor of the Church. According to the con-

stitution of the Soviet State, all citizens are granted real religious freedom of conscience. The decree on the separation of Church and State guarantees such freedom. The freedom of religious propaganda (as well as the freedom of the propaganda of anti-religious ideas) affords the believers an opportunity to defend the merits of their purely religious convictions. For this reason the churchmen cannot regard the Soviet power as an anti-Christian force; on the contrary, the Council calls attention to the fact that the Soviet power is the only one throughout the entire world that shall realize, by methods of statehood, the ideal of the Kingdom of God. Therefore every faithful churchman must not only be a loyal citizen, but also fight, by every means, in common with the Soviet power, for the realization of the ideals of the Kingdom of God upon earth.

5. Condemning the former Patriarch Tikhon as a counter-revolutionary and not a leader of the Church, the Council holds that even the very restoration of the Patriarchate was a definitely political, counter-revolutionary act. The ancient Church knew no Patriarchate and was governed collectively by its Councils, and the Holy Council therefore abolishes hereby the restored Patriarchate. Hereafter the Church is to be governed collectively by the Council.

6. Condemning the counter-revolution in the Church, punishing its leaders, abolishing the very institution of the Patriarchate, and recognizing the existing governmental authority, the Council creates normal conditions for the peaceful progress of Church life. Henceforth the whole existence of the Church is to be founded upon two principles: (1) with respect to the State, it must be the principle of separation of Church and State; (2) with respect to God, it must be the principle of genuine loyalty of churchmen to the true testament of Christ, the Redeemer.

Building upon these two foundations, the Church will become what it ought to be, through a loving, laboring

union of those who believe in God, His Christ and His Truth.

Such was the Resolution committing the Church to Bolshevism. The Council, after voting to send a copy of the Resolution to Lenin with the blessing of the Holy Fathers, closed May 9, 1923.

It is well understood that a Conciliary Decree, or Act of Council, signed by the bishops and other clergy present, is not a mere expression of opinion. It is obligatory upon the Church. It is intended to be so and is so understood and accepted. That this Council, then, should adopt such a resolution involving conscience, political theories, and Christian duties, shows what little hope there is that Russia can ever be evangelized by such leadership. To those who would pin their hopes on that, it must be a sad and disappointing outlook. These bishops and church leaders seem to have been utterly ignorant of the gospel of Christ and to have been in as dire need of instruction and regeneration as the poor people on whose shoulders they laid such burdens heavy to be borne.

For, if this resolution is to be taken seriously—and there is no other way to take it—the Council not only committed the Church to the Soviet government, but also to its pro-

gram of imposing its revolutionary principles upon other nations. Capital is the enemy, and all capitalistic institutions and governments must be destroyed. Society and civilization itself must be rebuilt upon the economic and social theories of Karl Marx: the folly of it all being that these very theories in their practical application have destroyed the whole social fabric, the industrial, commercial, and intellectual life of Russia—theories which the Russian government itself, by inviting the capital it expelled, is now trying to abandon. The concessions which the Soviets are so anxious to grant to foreign capitalists, the "New Economic Policy" which Lenin declared to be necessary, demonstrate the utter failure of Marxism, for concessions must ever remain empty gestures without capital which the Communists declare to be the enemy of Communism.

The Council went beyond even this in its ardor for Sovietism. It did not hesitate to introduce new doctrines into the Church. The resolution solemnly imposes with all the weight of religious authority these theories upon the Christian conscience as principles of the gospel ordained by Christ. It makes Communism a doctrine of the Church. "The Council proclaims capitalism to be a deadly

sin, and the fight against the same to be sacred to a Christian." That the Council, though evidently deficient in intellectual and moral qualities of a high order, as it was, could commit itself to theories condemned by the experience and intelligence of the world and lay it upon the conscience of Christian men as a sacred duty to fight for and yet expect to be considered a Christian Church, must be regarded as a blind, incomprehensible mystery.

The Orthodox Church of Russia with all its subserviency to the Tsar government, never went that far. It never so interwove political or economic theories into the articles of the Christian faith that it would be impossible for one to be a Christian without accepting in good faith the theories and politics of the government.

It is interesting to consider what the Church with this millstone of Communistic belief around its neck will do when the Soviet government itself, driven by uncontrollable forces, abandons it as unworkable. Like a ship left on the beach when the tide goes out, it will find itself high and dry; sustained neither by the Christian Church in any part of the world nor by the government whose Utopian dream it so readily adopted.

Such an Act as well as the assumptive authority to declare capitalism to be a deadly sin without any attempt to define what the Council meant by capitalism, or how much of deadly sin may be attributed to the ever-varying amount of capital one may possess, from ten cents to ten millions, indicates how incompetent such a body was to legislate concerning questions of profoundest importance to the modern world.

But this is just what this Conclave did and intended to do. It is well, therefore, that those who have been misled into thinking that this politico-religio group of clergy were the leaders of a great spiritual reformation in Russia should thoroughly inform themselves, and try to imagine what kind of reformation such reformers could possibly achieve. Such people were not helping Russia nor the Russian Church. They were aiding a group of Communists who adopted this resolution by a large majority, the paper being signed by fifty out of seventy-five active bishops.

It is certain that no Christian Church in the world will recognize a Church proclaiming such principles as a Church of Christ. And it is just as certain that just as the Soviet government will be compelled by the logic of the world's forces to abandon its

Communism, this resolution will, under more competent leaders, be wholly repudiated or allowed to quietly take its place among the shadows of things that might have been, but never were.

CHAPTER VI

SOVIET CHURCH

WITH the Patriarch in prison, priests executed, and hundreds awaiting trial, the Church everywhere was in a distracted condition. It is not difficult to account for this. The popular mind was not a political unit. Notwithstanding the energetic measures of the Communistic Soviets to solidify the peasants and the industrial workers in support of their party, there were still political groups which, while one with the Bolsheviks in defense of the country and the Revolution, were not exuberant in devotion to their political theories. But among these same people were also church people. These brought with them into the Church the same lines of cleavage that separated them in the world outside. Under such conditions the sense of oneness, of course, was more a hackneyed phrase than a conscious experience. Sheep without shepherds, the people in some places gradually wandered from the fold. In others they became divided in their allegiance to their divided ecclesiastical leaders. Nevertheless, the Church as a

whole, while sunk in fear of greater evils yet to come, remained steadfast in its loyalty to the Patriarch. The Church was stricken and God was far away, but some day he would return.

The clergy were divided. They also had suffered. Not included by the Soviet's decree in the category of those entitled to bread tickets, they were compelled to get their bread the best way they could or die of starvation. Because of such suffering many, perhaps out of sincere conviction, went over to the government and to avoid suspicion became the most ardent supporters of the Soviets. This it will be conceded they had a personal right to do. Political affiliations have nothing to do with religion nor with devotion to the Church, providing a government or political party does not deny the existence of God or forbid teaching of religion. The situation here, however, is very difficult owing to the dual character of the government, to discriminate between the government and the party in the government controlling it. The Communist party controls the Soviet government; Communism as taught by Karl Marx, Engels, Bucharnin, being its corner stone, but the government as such, and in its official designation, styles itself the Russian Social Federation Soviet Republic. What

that means in its inner workings can only be understood by a study of the aim and ultimate purposes of Communism itself.

For instance, according to government decrees, there is freedom of worship in Russia. One may profess any religion he pleases or none at all. Those who defend Sovietism strongly emphasize this decree in refutation of the charge of the persecuting spirit of the Russian government, and thus by omissions delude those who do not perceive the deception. There is religious freedom according to the decree. But when the Commissars concerning separation of Church and state, and of school and Church, issue their decrees, the kind of freedom religion enjoys becomes very vague and uncertain. So far as the requirements of the Christian religion are concerned there is no real freedom. The baptism of children is prohibited, teaching religion to the young, to any gatherings of persons under eighteen years of age, is forbidden. Since, according to Zinoviev, Communism is an aggressive atheism, preaching against atheism may easily be construed as pulpit propaganda against the government, the preacher arrested and the Church closed. Constructive treason, against which our Constitution protects the citizen by defining treason, may be as danger-

ous a weapon in the hands of Communists as it was among French Royalists. Every church building and every article in a church belongs to the state, but the state must be at no expense in maintaining it. It must be kept in repair by those who use the building. If any needful article is lost, destroyed, or decayed, it must be replaced at the expense of the Church.

A Church that is not free to teach, that is not permitted to baptize its children, that is not free to preach the doctrines of Christianity without danger of inciting rebellion against the government, is not free. It is a Church in shackles. Such freedom is a mockery. It is freedom to the length of the chain—and such freedom is a delusion and a snare.

Similar double-dealing is practiced in official relations with foreign governments. Rykov, Trotsky, Kamenev, Lunacharsky, and their colleagues are all Communists. These men with Zinoviev, who is chairman, are all members of the Third International. The avowed purpose of the International is world-revolution, and yet in their dealings with foreign governments they are able to deny that the Soviet government is a Communistic government and that it has for its aims the destruction of all other governments. Docu-

ments sent out by the Communists on one side of the street fomenting insurrections and strikes among the working classes in all countries may, when discovered, be indignantly denied by the government on the other side. How this is done may be understood from the following authentic information:

Subject: System of interlocking Directorates in Soviet Russia.

The attached table is designed to illustrate one of the means by which the Communist Party realizes its dictatorship in Soviet Russia; that is, the so-called system of interlocking directorates whereby the individuals in control of the Communist Party occupy commanding positions in the various other Bolshevik organizations.

The keystone of the entire system is the Political Bureau of the Communist Party. The powers of this body are practically unlimited. It is understood that it decides all questions of domestic and foreign politics, nominates all important officials, and reviews all court decisions that have or are given political importance.

At the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, Kamenev, in touching upon the complaints of Krassin and Larin that "decisions resolved upon by specialists, engineers, and learned agriculturists are rejected by the political body," stated that "in the Political Bureau is concentrated at the given moment for a given limited period of time the entire political will and thought of the labor classes."

The Political Bureau at present consists of seven members with four alternates. Previously it consisted of five members and three alternates. It has recently been increased in accordance with a program of the Bolshevik leaders to take in fresh blood "as the nucleus within the Central Committee which has become ex-

pert in management is already growing old and must be replaced." (Stalin: *Pravda*, April 19, 1923.) Apparently Rykov, Tomsky, Molotov and Rudzutak represent the new men that have been admitted, as in the early days of the revolution, in 1919, for instance, the Political Bureau consisted of Lenin, Trotsky, Kamenev, Stalin, and Krestinsky, with Bukharin, Zinoviev, and Kalinin alternates.

The attached table shows clearly how the Political Bureau controls the Federation of Soviet Republics through the Soviet of Labor and Defense, the Communist Internationale through the Central Executive Committee, and the Trade Union International through the Executive Committee.

Then follows the table.

Those bishops and priests who submitted to the Soviets and joined the reformists, Antonine, Krassnitsky, Vedensky, *et al.*, may have found a way to reconcile the moral difficulties in their situation. The deep wrong, however, was not in accepting the *de facto* government, but in turning traitors to their fellow priests. In order to convince the government of their devoted loyalty and to obtain its favor, they offered to place "cells," that is, spies and informers, among the bishops and priests, so that those clergy who were objectionable to the "Living-Church" leaders could be easily disposed of without suspicion being attached to themselves.

A writer for the London Times, a Church of

England chaplain, under date of June 9, 1923, states:

> Most readers of the "Times" are probably familiar with the "cell" system, by means of which the Russian Communists remain in power. As nearly all the public institutions in Russia are filled with secret enemies of the Bolshevists, the latter place at the head of all such institutions so-called Communist "cells" of two or three men to observe, inform on, and terrify the employees of these institutions.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> I have in my possession a copy of a written application which some of the leaders of the new church sent to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee over a year ago. In this application these priests asked for permission to form themselves into a sort of Communist cell, which I have described above; and they proposed to lodge that cell in the Higher Church Administration itself. Moreover, they calmly described in detail how they would plant similar cells in every ecclesiastical center of the Orthodox Church, how they would spy on the Patriarchal authorities (the Patriarch had not then been deposed), and how they would compel the Church to assist the government in the execution of its Communistic schemes.

The principal leaders in this reform movement were a bishop, Antonine; an archpriest, Vedensky; Krassnitsky, Eudokin, and various members of the Council of 1923. Bishop Antonine had been disciplined and not reinstated. From all accounts he is a tempestuous character, thought by his colleague Krassnitsky to be probably insane. According to the Rev. Dr.

Julius F. Hecker, living in Moscow and who in a public address, November 25, 1921, styles himself as "the connecting link," an intermediary between these men and American connections, Antonine "stands firm on the old monastic traditions and leads the fight against any Protestant evangelical tendencies in the church. . . . He is against any radical change either in the government of the Church or its doctrines. . . . As to the religion of the future he does not believe that it is to be much different from the religion of the past."

There is, however, another side to this. Antonine may not be so recalcitrant as the partisans of Krassnitsky and Vedensky would picture him. A correspondent of the New York World, for more than a year in Russia, describes Antonine as "a mountain of a man. An enormous head rests upon great hunched shoulders. His hands are big, his eyes wide and blazing." "I found him," says this correspondent, "sitting in his study at his small desk in the barely furnished room. One big hand, clinching a long pen, moved slowly over the long, yellow papers. Antonine is one of the few frank men I have met in Russia during a year spent there. He was a rebel priest under the Tsar. He was exiled for revolutionary opinion in 1905. Speaking of the

'Living Church,' he said, 'Unfortunately, we are bound hand and foot by the control of the Secret Service men who use us as a political institution.' Antonine was bitter and unhappy. He still remains the head of the Living Church because he believes that in time he can rid the Church of the Tcheka influence. He is an old man. The Living Church was his dream for many years. He is clinging to the shell of it."

Krassnitsky was a soldier in the Red Army. He is declared to be a clerical agent of the government. Of him this same correspondent says:

Krassnitsky was neither frank nor definite, but his views were interesting. I asked him: "After all, in what way does your church differ from that of the Tsar?"

He answered: "The Tsarist Church was a tool of autocracy. Ours is for the revolution."

"How can you support a party which states frankly it is out to destroy all religion?" I asked.

"We believe," he answered, "that by working from within we can destroy the bourgeois influence of the Church. You cannot destroy religion. I myself was a candidate for the Communist Party. I am for the international world revolution. We support the Red Army because that is necessary for a world revolution. Our aim is to work from within the Church for the Communist State, the revolution."

There were certain contradictory forces I asked him to reconcile: No man can be a member or even a candidate for the Communist Party and still retain a be-

lief in any faith. The Communist Party program declares war on all religion.

His answer was: "The Communists are wrong in believing they can destroy religion. Otherwise their program is immaculate and unquestionable. The Red Army is a Christian army. Christ would bless the Bolsheviks if he were on earth."

Vedensky, who took the place of Bishop Arsenius, who was martyred in Siberia, was not educated for the ministry. He is described as a mystic of oratorical ability and of intense prejudices. He is the same Vedensky that denounced Benjamin the Metropolitan Bishop of Petrograd, executed by the Bolsheviks; the same Vedensky who was stoned by the people for his part in the trial of Benjamin.

In response to a request made October, 1922, for facts only concerning these leaders, the following response was given from an authentic source well qualified to give judgment:

Reliable news from Soviet Russia is scarcely obtainable, but I shall answer your questions as accurately as possible.

The leaders of the "*New*," "Reform," or "Living-Church" movement in Russia are a few discredited malcontents, some of whom had previously been disciplined by the Russian Orthodox Church. Bishop Antonin was suspended some years ago and not reinstated. These men are simply rebels subverting a small group to their purposes. They are not accepted, either by the people or by the clergy of the Church as having any standing other than that of traitors to their sacred

trusts and vows. The opinion of the Church authorities and those informed is that this movement will soon die out for lack of support of any permanent or dependable sort. Reform of the Church will never come through the rebellion of its discredited members. The persecutions and trials of the Church will purify and strengthen it by driving out just such men, who are the weakness of any organization. How closely or in what manner this movement is or may become connected with the Soviet government we do not know. The press in this country indicates a close coordination, but how accurate these reports are we have no means of telling. Neither do we know definitely the program or aims of the movement.

The doctrine of the Russian Church, being that of the whole Orthodox Church of some two hundred million people of various races and languages, was fixed by the great Oecumenical Councils of the Church and can be modified only by such Councils in accordance with the canons of true Catholic Christianity. It is impossible for a local, national, or linguistic branch of the Orthodox Church, much less for a sporadic movement within such a branch, to change Orthodox doctrine. Polity could only be affected in minor matters of local or racial customs. The great body of Orthodox polity is essentially the same everywhere and a local movement cannot alter it fundamentally either in Russia or in our own country. It is not likely that this movement will leave any permanent imprint on the Church. It is Bolshevism in the Church and such anarchy will have no more effect on the future of Church than of state. It is neither positive nor developmental, but self-destructive.

It is said that Bishop Benjamin was offered his life if he appealed for it to the Central Execution Soviet Committee. He refused,

saying he was ready to render his account to God, but had committed no crime against the Bolshevik government. The Soviets' hired assassin placed a revolver at the back of his neck and shot him. The Archbishop of Canterbury published a letter he had received stating that the last seen of Bishop Benjamin was when he was being taken away in an automobile.

The expressed purpose of these priests was to reform the Church. In order to do this they thought it necessary to do exactly what the Bolsheviks had done for the Kerensky provisional government—seize the government of the Church, displace such clergy as would not join them, and transform the Russian Orthodox Church into a Soviet Church. But whatever their purpose when the split came and the Church was divided into factions, the government having achieved its purpose had no further use for either of them. The purpose of the Communists was accomplished—the enfeebling or destruction of the Church. Under date—Moscow May 5, *Pravda,* Communist organ, in its editorial columns said, "It is self-understood that our party shall not give its blessing even to such a religion as is trying to bless our party, just as it does not give the Communistic label to that group of bour-

geoisie which abandons the old frame of mind and supports us."

The *modus operandi* for obtaining control of the Church was not as regular nor as pious as the apologists for these priests would have the Christian world believe. They have been represented as having a sincere desire to follow Christ and to break away from the dogmas and superstitions, from the ikon and relic-worship, of a worn-out Church. With this in view they sought an interview, it is alleged, with the imprisoned Patriarch, and, according to their statement, obtained from him authority to superintend the Church during those critical times and to call a Council for the remedying of evils that afflicted the body now without a visible head.

The facts seem to have been quite different. On his release from prison and learning what had been done under his supposed authority, the Patriarch declared the statements of these priests to be a tissue of falsehood and fraud.

Dissensions, however, broke out among the reformers. Antonine founded the "Living Church"; Vedensky, the "Holy Apostolic Church," and others some other church. However, a "Superior Church Administration" was organized with Antonine as president and Krassnitsky as his deputy. The Administra-

tion was not a success. Antonine and Krassnitsky quarreled and a Congress was called of the "Living Church." It met and declared itself a "Church Constituent Assembly." It also confirmed the acts of the Supreme Church Administration. The report of this body showed that in the short space of two months before it had expelled twenty-four bishops from their dioceses. The Congress had deprived thirty-six more. The Assembly decreed that the Patriarch's name should be dropped from the Liturgy, that it be not mentioned at the church services, and that the Conclave of All-Russia, which was to meet in the near future, should unfrock him.

The scenes at the Congress were not altogether edifying. Antonine and Krassnitsky again quarreled. Krassnitsky assumed the chair, thereby ousting his superior, whom he denounced as a remnant of the old episcopal monks. Antonine, after much pleading, was allowed to speak, but he was soon interrupted and in great anger left the Congress to form a "Church Revival Party"—which came to nothing.

The government seems to have been delighted with the split in the Church, but it was not quite sure of its effect. These quarrels among the reformers and their antag-

onistic church parties might have a contrary effect upon the people than was designed. The result might be a solidifying of the faithful in loyalty to the old Church, which was the very opposite result the government desired. A government organ declared: "We have stirred up a hornet's nest; we have created a bedlam. Whenever a leader of the 'Living Church' Party appears in public he is greeted with abuse. His sermons are interrupted; groups of disturbers ostentatiously leave the church and arrange meetings outside. If you go to any place where Bishop Antonine attempts to conduct a service or address a meeting, you may fancy you are in a madhouse."

Such was the situation in 1922, and such were the men who were to reform the Orthodox Russian Church. But it is evident from the facts presented that these men did not represent the Russian people, the Russian Church, or its ministry. Nor have they had any authority to do so. As the statement from a representative of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Church suggests, they were a mixed group, a body of malcontents with various maladies, each group seeking some change—it mattered little what—that would in any way express their dissatisfaction with the rules by which they had been governed, al-

though among them there were undoubtedly persons sincerely desirous of reform and anxious for a change in the unspiritual character of the Church and its ignorant priesthood.

In October the Soviet government confirmed the establishment of the Supreme Church Administration. It was now as a matter of compromise composed of members of all parties, the Living-Church Party, the Revival-Church Party, the Apostolic Party and the Right and Left Wings of all parties. Such a combination would convey the impression of a solid unified *bloc* in opposition to the Old National Church, which the Soviets looked upon as their greatest enemy because of its hold upon the people.

It is asserted that this Supreme Church Administration is in reality a section of the Agitation Department of the Communistic Party and is controlled by the Central Executive of the Communist Party in Moscow. Vladimir N. Lvoff who was, as procurator of the Holy Synod, a member of the Sobor of 1917, but later became a violent supporter of the Soviet government, was appointed a member of this Supreme Church Administration; thus connection was established between the government and the Administration.

What the proofs are for this statement concerning the Administration we do not know,

but it is borne out by the statement of Bishop Antonine, founder of the Living-Church party. In the government official organ *Izvestia,* No. 128, 1922, he wrote, "The government proposes that we should act in contact with it," and the New York World, May 21, 1923, states that Antonine said to its correspondent, "We are bound hand and foot by the control of the secret service men, who use us as a political institution or weapon."

The Congress broke up in disorder. Unity was not visible, but a call was made for an All-Russia Conclave to meet at Moscow, 1923.

Dark days, however, intervened both for the government and the Church between the Congress now adjourned and the meeting of the Conclave. The persecution of the clergy of all churches, Russian, Catholic, Jewish, arrested the attention of the whole world. The correspondents of the world's newspapers by getting out of Russia were now enabled to give particular details of the executions which had taken place without having their reports subjected to the scrutiny of the Moscow censor. How severe that scrutiny was the correspondents of all great newspapers both in England and the United States bear abundant testimony. Nothing that might compromise the Soviets with foreign governments was per-

mitted. The foreign press was gagged. The other papers, nationalized by the government, printed only what the government gave them. Their function was to create public opinion, not to publish news.

The most noticeable event following the adjournment of the Congress was the arrest of Archbishop Cepliak, Monsignor Bukekevitch, and sixteen Polish priests of the Roman Catholic Church. The charges against them and the evidence offered, too long to be presented, were the same as those that had been made against other supposed enemies of the government. What the result of the trial would be seems to have been a foregone conclusion. A fair trial was neither given nor expected. Politics and religion were intermingled. It was shown that the priests had resisted the decrees of the government concerning the seizure of church properties, and contrary to the laws governing religious instruction had taught the precepts of religion to the young in church buildings. Special enmity was shown by the Prosecutor Krylenko to Bukekevitch and Cepliak, but no direct evidence was presented proving that these men had entered into treasonable negotiations with any foreign power or religious authority. These prelates and priests pleaded their rights according to

their religious convictions to teach the young, and in obedience to their vows as priests.

Whatever be their denominational beliefs they were Christian believers. They did not deny their religion. They proved themselves martyrs to the Christian faith worthy of a place among those of the early Church.

There had been so many executions, so many baths of blood, that the Christian nations were sickened at the prospect of more blood-letting by a government that at the same time was seeking to obtain the recognition of civilized people. The defense of the Soviets that there were no religious persecutions, that the political crimes for which the victims had paid the penalty were such as any government would punish in self-defense, availed little. The various governments knew the character of the government they were dealing with. A universal protest without regard to religious belief or church affiliation denounced the probable murder of the prisoners.

Poland protested. The premier in his note to Obolenski, the Soviet minister to Poland, said, "Acting not only as the head of the Polish government, but as the spokesman of the civilized world which indignantly condemns this unprecedented act of flagrant violation of liberty of conscience and the ele-

mentary rights of citizens, I direct the Soviet government's attention to the responsibility it would assume by execution of the sentence."

France protested. Representatives of every religion uttered their protests in a document which, after reciting the execution of the Vice-General of Petrograd and the imprisonment of Tikhon and notable prelates, declared:

> The Soviet government is trying to uproot religion from the souls of the people as useless and dangerous, and is employing every means to arrive at that result, including confiscation of property, profanation of churches and synagogues, parodies on religious ceremonies, official atheistic schools, and prison, torture and death.

The protest goes on to recite the execution of the Vicar General of Petrograd and the imprisonment of Doctor Tikhon, former Patriarch of all Russia, and other notable prelates, saying:

> The Russian persecution is against every religion. The evil already done and the sufferings endured are great, and there are fears of a terrible future.

The appeal is signed by Cardinal Dubois, Archbishop of Paris; Israel Levi, Grand Rabbi of Paris; E. Grun, President of the Protestant Federation of France; the Rev. Chauncey W. Goodrich, pastor of the American Church; the Rev. Frederick W. Beekman,

rector of the American Pro-Cathedral in Paris; Archimandrite Kibarian of the Armenian Church; V. Rabu, head of the Rumanian Church; Germanos Vasilaskis, head of Greek Orthodox Church; the Metropolitan of the Russian Orthodox Church in Western Europe, and numerous chaplains and vicars of English churches.

The United States voiced its protest through the Ambassador, Mr. Houghton. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, representing one hundred and twenty-five thousand churches, urged human consideration of the case of the Patriarch Tikhon, who next was to be tried, and complete liberty of religious faith.

England sent a vigorous protest. It read:

To all men and women of good-will:

The last few weeks have witnessed a portent which has filled generous-hearted men and women with horror. The ruthless warfare which the Soviet government has long carried on against all forms of religious belief has come to a head. During the period of Soviet rule hundreds of thousands of religious people and ministers of religion of all ranks and creeds have been subjected to savage persecution, the express object of which has been to root religion out of the land. The central facts for which religion stands have been systematically outraged and insulted; the most sacred of religious festivals have been made an occasion for a blasphemous travesty, and at this moment the attack upon religion itself finds fresh illustration in the

trial for their lives of the chief leaders of religion in Russia.

The Bolsheviki themselves have not disguised the purpose which they have in view. In their own journal, only three weeks ago, they confessed both their aim and their difficulty. To quote their words: "We must carry on our agitation against religion just as systematically as we do in political questions, but with even more determination. . . . Although we have declared war on the denizens of heaven it is by no means easy to sweep them from the households of workmen."

It is for the sake of these workmen, and of the whole people of Russia, and for the preservation in their hearts of faith in God and maintenance of religious liberty that we appeal. We represent many religious communities and many political opinions, but we are united in the indignation and horror with which we regard the present policy of systematic persecution in all its forms. Such a policy cannot be tolerated in silence by those who value religion or liberty. Our protest will, we are confident, evoke a response everywhere on the part of those who have at heart the well-being of the world.

RANDALL CANTUAR, Archbishop of Canterbury.
COSMO EBOR, Archbishop of York.
FRANCIS, Cardinal Bourne.
JOHN SMITH, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.
J. D. JONES, Congregationalist, Moderator of the Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches of England.
J. H. SHAKESPEARE, Baptist, ex-Moderator of the Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches of England.
W. E. LEWIS ROBERTSON, Presbyterian, one of the Secretaries of the Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches of England.

F. C. Spurr, Baptist, President of the National Free Church Council.

Thomas Nightingale, United Methodist, Secretary of the National Free Church Council.

J. Scott Lidgett, Wesleyan, Honorary Secretary of the National Free Church Council.

John Clifford, ex-President of the Baptist World Alliance.

A. E. Garvie, ex-Chairman of the Congregational Union.

R. F. Horton, Minister of Lyndhurst.

R. D. Hampstead, Congregational Church.

J. H. Jowett, formerly Minister of the Westminster Chapel.

W. Bramwell Booth, General of the Salvation Army.

J. H. Hertz, Chief Rabbi.

The attempt to make it appear that this universal condemnation was the result of Roman Catholic propaganda merited the ridicule it received from people of common sense. It was impossible to believe that such representatives of English-speaking Protestantism could all be so easily deceived, and their governments too, as this appeal to religious prejudice would have people believe.

The protests came too late, or they were of no avail. The trial was over. Bukekevitch had been dead three days before the news of his death reached the outside world. He was shot in the cellars of the *Tcheka*.

CHAPTER VII

TIKHON

THE Patriarch's trial for treason against the state had been set for April 23, but was postponed again till the Conclave had reached the decision in his case. Numerous protests, as it has been seen, had been made by foreign governments and Christian organizations against the death sentence which it was certain would be inflicted upon him. Notwithstanding this universal indignation, religious persecution did not entirely cease. The *Izvestia* of April 18, 1923, reports from Kharkovoff: "The last remnant of Tikhon's following among the Kharkov clergy has just been liquidated. Sixteen priests, among them Bishop Paul, were arrested, also two 'black hundred' men, Stetsenko and Gubner. The 'black hundred' priests will be deported from the Ukraine." This was a few days before the day set for Tikhon's trial. The tone of the report indicates the antagonistic spirit still manifested against the Patriarch. The extreme penalty which Vedensky, now elected to high office, had declared the Patriarch

should receive would, therefore, have created no surprise.

But something happened. The Patriarch had been detained in the Donskoi Monastery. One day, after five o'clock tea, he was suddenly taken ill. The trouble seems to have been in his stomach. He vomited and then fainted, remaining in that condition for some time. Some of his friends supposed he had been poisoned, but the Patriarch attributed the cause to irregular digestion. The government, however, not altogether satisfied that an attempt had not been made to poison their illustrious prisoner, and not willing that they should be accused of such a crime by the world at large if another attempt should be more successful, removed him to the G. P. U., the State Administration, now superseded by the O. G. P. U., or Unified State Political Department. Friends of the Patriarch who, according to a well-informed authority, have published a circumstantial account of what happened, state that during his imprisonment at the G. P. U. government authorities proposed that he should acknowledge the Soviet government, promising, should he do so, that great good would result to the Church and that the priests languishing in prison would be released.

Whether such a proposition was made or not matters little. It is quite probable that the government was anxious to be rid of him. Having been condemned by the Church, they were not at all desirous of bringing upon themselves the odium of putting him to death. Nor is it probable that after sacrificing so many priests and bishops they should be willing to risk solidifying the masses against them in any kind of a holy war or of still further estranging foreign governments or of making Tikhon a martyr. Some men are more to be dreaded after death than before. It is probable also that the government's design was to humiliate Tikhon and thus destroy his influence with the people.

It is much more probable that the old man, weak and worn in body and mind from long imprisonment and lonely brooding over the state of the Church, the murder of her priests, and the triumph of his enemies, saw clearly that further resistance to the government would be useless. Acceptance of the situation was the only way to save the Church and gain the freedom of those filling government prisons.

To ascribe selfish motives only as impelling reasons for his recognition of the government is an easy way to belittle a struggling soul

swept by many winds. Men of breadth and understanding and entering by reason of their larger sympathies into the experience of superior minds struggling in the nighttime of the soul in some dark Gethsemane, will look with disdain upon low insinuations. They live in larger worlds. There are other motives than the worst that actuate real men.

But whatever were the motives, the Church and the various parties, especially the monarchists, who had hoped to use the Church for their political purposes, were astonished and disappointed to read in the government organ of June 27, 1923, that the Patriarch Tikhon had made a confession of his disloyal acts, acknowledged the government, and had been released from prison. The Patriarch's statement was:

Having been brought up in a monarchial society and until my arrest having been under the influence of anti-Soviet persons, I was indeed very hostile toward the Soviet Government, and at times my hostility turned into active measures against the Government; for instance, on the account of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty in 1918, the anathematizing of the Soviet Government that same year, and then by the declaration against the decree of taking out of the Church valuables in 1922. All my anti-Soviet actions, barring some uncorrectness, were stated in the accusatory act of the Supreme Court. Recognizing the correctness of the Supreme Court's accusation and its sentence, conforming to the clauses of the Criminal Code, I repent in all my actions against

the Government, and request the Supreme Court to change their sentence and set me free.

Herewith I declare to the Soviet Government that henceforth I am no more an enemy to the Soviet Government. I have finally and resolutely severed all connections with the foreign and internal monarchists and white guards' counter-revolution.

While this acknowledgment by the Patriarch of the Soviet government, which we do not presume to judge, and his declaration to sever himself from all anti-revolutionary movements created much dissatisfaction among the monarchists in exile, the people, though at first confused, reflected that possibly there were unknown reasons for his act which would appear to the benefit of the Church in God's good time. The masses of the faithful greeted him with affectionate veneration. The churches where he officiated could scarcely contain the multitudes that crowded to hear him, and on some occasions, as when on his release from prison in the Donskoi Monastery, immense crowds overflowed into the open spaces.

A lady of eminence in the Church shows the state of the public mind as far as it relates to the Church at the time:

Since a fortnight we Russians are cruelly suffering at heart on account of the decision taken by our Patriarch, its consequences, and the rumors that are the re-

sult. You are sufficiently acquainted with Russian life to know that there is a wide difference between Russia and "official Russia" and that most of what is published in the press are shameless lies, and I am sure that you never accept as gospel truth all that our newspapers choose to say.

But Patriarch Tikhon's demeanor is a riddle for us all—we feel there is a mystery about him, but we cannot get at it. The simple folk are happier! They have accepted his return as a blessing; they absolutely refuse to believe the newspaper talk; they flock about him enthusiastically and do not bother as to what the price of this return has been. Unfortunately, we of the cultured classes cannot accept the thing so simply—we must know the how and why, and this makes us suffer intensely. Our instinct tells us—and so do our hearts—that he is blameless and has done the right thing, but when we reason and read his words, we are apt to think that he has forfeited his right to our esteem, that he has fallen from the height upon which he had been standing.

What a good thing it would be if the people abroad knew how the population of Moscow is meeting its Patriarch!—all things that they will not find in the newspapers. His return has been like a triumph. The parishioners of most of the churches ask him to come and celebrate divine service and his days (Sundays and holidays) are already taken up in this way up to October first. When he makes his appearance flowers are strewn under his feet, and in one church he walked literally upon a carpet of flowers. A whiff of fresh air seems to have entered our church life, the bells seem to ring more joyfully; and this is not my personal opinion but that of many.

Tikhon was released late in June. The conditions under which he regained freedom

seemed in no wise to have affected his ecclesiastical status, nor was his defiant spirit toward the Council subdued. The sense of his responsibility for the welfare of the Church in such critical times when he knew, as he only knew, except those who were in the plot, that the Church was being falsely led, compelled him, as was his duty, to make known to the world the conspiracy that had been hatched to rob him of the authority which the Great Sobor of All Russia in 1917 had intrusted to him.

Immediately, therefore, on his release, ignoring the decree of the Council which had unfrocked him, and denouncing the Council as a trumped-up affair without any validity or authority in the Church of Russia, he issued a Proclamation which with all its setting is among the most dramatic *exposés* of ecclesiastic chicanery ever known to church history.

The "Living-Church" group had given publicly their version of how they had obtained authority from the Patriarch to act in his place, to call a Council and to govern the Church. The world outside knew no better. But it was that version which had been given from platform and pulpit in America. Tikhon was in prison and could not speak. The lead-

ers of the Council would unfrock him, degrade him from the ministry, and turn him over to the civil power. Condemned by the Church, he would be speedily brought to trial and his execution could bring no protest from foreign governments.

The unexpected happened. The government did not take the "Living-Church" leaders into its confidence. Tikhon was set at liberty. Immediately he issued this Proclamation to All Russia:

By the Lord's Mercy, we, the humble Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia—to the most reverend Archbishops, reverend Priests, and honored Monks and all the faithful sons of the Russian Orthodox Church—God's peace and blessing:

More than a year ago, in consequence of circumstances well known to all, we had been set aside from our pastoral service, and have since then not been able to stand personally at the head of the administration, and to guard the Church's traditions, sanctified by centuries.

Therefore, as soon as it proved desirable, we, conforming to the statutes of the "Sobor," which decreed the rules according to which the Patriarch was to administer the Russian Church, and in compliance with the decree of the Holy Synod, November 7, 1920, considered it just to transfer the fullness of spiritual power, for the time of our being set aside from service, to a substitute elected by ourselves, the Metropolitan of Jaroslav, Agathangel; he was to convoke a second local "Sobor" of the Russian Church, for the purpose of deliberating on questions of the Supreme Ecclesiastic Administration and other Church needs; we had been

informed that the civil authorities were not opposed to it. Metropolitan Agathangel accepted the mission we had trusted to him. But, for reasons over which we had no control, he was prevented from fulfilling his obligations. Ambitious and self-willed individuals profited thereby, not entering by the door, but climbing up another way (Saint John 10. 8) and unlawfully grasping the supreme authority over the Russian Orthodox Church.

On May 18 last (1922) during our imprisonment in the Troitzky convent, the priests (Vedensky, Belkoff, and Kalinowsky, who but a short time previous had renounced Holy Orders, presented us, under the pretext of caring for the welfare of the Church, with a written statement. Therein they complained that, in consequence of existing circumstances, many church matters remained unsolved. They begged us to intrust our chancery to them, as well as the charge of all the correspondence received.

Taking into consideration the usefulness of such a measure, we gave in to their solicitation and signed their petition with the following resolution:

"The undersigned (that is, the clergymen who had signed the statement) are intrusted to take over and transmit to the most highly reverend Agathangel, upon his arrival in Moscow, all the business of the Synod, the secretary Nousenoff taking part in the work also."

According to this resolution they were only intrusted to take over the business and transmit it to the Metropolitan Agathangel on his arrival in Moscow. We gave them no indication as to how they were to act with the papers in case Metropolitan Agathangel should not come to Moscow, as we could not at that time foresee that eventuality. There could be no question of my blessing them to replace the Metropolitan and set themselves at the head of the Ecclesiastic Administration, as the plenipotence connected with the standing of a

bishop cannot be transferred to priests. However, they decided to look upon the resolution given by us as an act of transmission to them of Church authority, and, having come to an agreement with Bishops Antonine and Leonidas, they formed the so-called Supreme Ecclesiastic Administration.

In order to justify their self-willed behavior they more than once insisted (both in the press and during public meetings) on the fact of their having entered upon the management of Church business, because of an agreement with the Patriarch (*Pravda*, 21–22), that they were members of the Supreme Ecclesiastic Administration in obedience to the resolution of the Patriarch Tikhon (Clergyman Vedenski, *Revolution of the Church*, p. 28), and that they had accepted from the hands of the Patriarch himself the Supreme Ecclesiastic Administration (The Living Church, 4–5, p. 9). During the meeting of June 12, 1922, convoked for the purpose of discussing the motion of one of the clergymen to abstain from any new church reforms without the Patriarch's blessing, the chairman of the meeting, Bishop Antonine, declared: "That as the Patriarch Tikhon had given over all his authority to the Supreme Ecclesiastic Administration, we have now no need to run after him seeking to take from him what he no longer possesses" (*Izvestia*, 16/IV-22n132).

To-day we solemnly and openly declare from the holy ambo, that all these positive statements of an agreement with us, and the transmission of the rights and duties of the Patriarch of the Russian Church to the Supreme Ecclesiastic Administration formed by the Bishops Antonine and Leonidas, and the priests Vedensky and Krassnitsky, and Belkoff are nothing less than a lie and a fraud, and that the above-named persons have willfully usurped power without the Church having given them any authority to do so.

All such persons the Holy Church judged severely. According to the sixteenth article of the Council of

Antioch, a bishop who digresses from the lawful order, and willfully invades a diocese which is not his own, even though implored to do so by the people, is deprived of his sacerdotal dignity for the sin of infringing the laws of the Church. Those who have founded the unlawful Supreme Ecclesiastic Administration in Moscow are guilty in the eyes of the Church. They have aggravated their position by ordaining bishops to the usurped districts and have incurred thereby censure according to the 35th ordinance of the Holy Apostles, which threatens to deprive of the right to hold Holy Orders all such who were ordained themselves, or ordained others in a diocese not belonging to them.

And how have they used the usurped authority of the Church? They have used it, not toward the building up of the Church, but in sowing seeds of sedition and heresy, thereby depriving the Orthodox bishops who had remained true to their duty, and refused to submit to them, of their dioceses; they have used it to persecute the reverent priests, who according to the canons of the Church have not submitted to them; they have founded everywhere the so-called "Living Church," which despises the authority of the Universal Church and strives to undermine the needful church discipline, so as to let their own party triumph and carry out its desires without taking into consideration the unanimous voice of all the believers. All these actions have separated them from the body of the Universal Church and deprived them of God's blessing, which belongs only to the Church of Christ.

Consequently, all that has been decreed during our absence by the ruling Church, which has neither legal rights, nor canonically transmitted authority, is to be looked upon as illegal and non-valid; and all actions and sacraments performed by bishops and clergymen who have forsaken the Church are devoid of God's blessing and power; the faithful taking part in such prayers and sacraments shall receive no sanctification

thereby, but shall be condemned for participating in their sin.

Our heart has suffered acutely, hearing of all the seditions and disorders which have arisen in the Church after our having been set aside; hearing of the violence exercised by the unauthorized unlawful church governments; of the party strife; of the spirit of animosity and division working there, where love and brotherhood should be uppermost. Meanwhile, as long as we had not regained our liberty, we could do nothing to assist in bringing peace to the Church and laying down this hurtful strife, but pray in the secrecy of our chamber. Now that we are at liberty again and are in full cognizance of Church matters, we have again taken upon ourself the Sacerdotal Patriarchal Authority, with which we had temporarily endowed our representative Metropolitan Agathangel; who, however, for reasons over which he had no control, had not been able to exercise it.

We now take upon ourselves the fulfillment of our pastoral duties, fervently praying that the true King of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ, should grant us strength and wisdom to build up His Church, to instill the spirit of peace, and love, and meekness. At the same time we address ourself to all bishops, priests, and faithful sons of the Church, who true to duty have bravely stood up for the God-inspired statutes of the Church's life and beg them to help us by their advice, their labor, and especially their prayers to the Creator and Provider of all, asking Him to bring peace into the Church.

And we beseech those that have, consciously or unconsciously, knowingly or ignorantly, been tempted by the evil spirit of our days, have acknowledged unlawful authority, and fallen away from the unity of the Church and the blessing of God, to admit their sin, to cleanse themselves by repentance, and return to the saving arms of the only Universal Church.

May God's blessing and the prayers of His Holy Mother, the Virgin Mary, and of our Fathers, the Holy Moscow miracle workers, Peter, Alexis, Jonah, Philip, Hermogenes and all the saints who have found favor in God's sight be with you. Amen.

HUMBLE TIKHON,
Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.

Moscow, Donskoi Cloister.
1923, July 15th.

We may endeavor to diminish our fears and enlarge our hopes that good may come out of evil, but unless this Proclamation is refuted it must destroy the last lingering hope that the "Living-Church" movement is worthy of slightest confidence. Never was there a more thoroughgoing *exposé* and condemnation of a crime. The Patriarch of the Holy All-Russia Orthodox Greek Church in the full exercise of his pastoral office and from the *ambone,* the most sacred pulpit where the gospel is read, as if he stood in the judgment seat of Christ, denounces the statements of the Living-Church leaders to be "NOTHING LESS THAN A FRAUD AND A LIE!"

On or about the same date, June 28, 1923, the Patriarch issued another statement showing the defense he would have made for his action had he been permitted to speak for himself before the Council which, contrary to the canons of the Church, condemned him

without trial, and while he was yet a prisoner in the hands of the government. It also again reveals his personal and official attitude toward the counterfeit Council which had usurped authority, the leaders of which now dropping the "Living Church" appropriates the title of the "Church of Russia."

The translation is very imperfect, as the reader will observe, but it is given as it was published in the *Svit*—the "Light"—a paper by the Russian Orthodox Catholic Mutual Aid Society at Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania:

PROCLAMATION

By God's Grace, Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia Tikhon, to the archpriests and laymen of the Russian Orthodox Church. Let the Lord's benediction and peace multiply among you.

It has already been more than one year past since my last word to you. We have been living during hard times, and that hardship has been especially strongly impressed on me during the last months. You know that the last Council (Sobor) which was held a month ago, decided not only to deprive me of the rights of Patriarch but also to discharge me from the Order of Monks as an apostate from Christ's doctrines and a traitor to the Church. When on May 8, 1923, the deputation from the Council made this decision known to me I protested that the decision was without basis and wholly incorrect in form. According to apostolic rules (74), a bishop is called upon by a bishop's court by two bishops. In case he refuses obedience he is called again by two bishops and again the third time, the same procedure is followed as to his, and after the last re-

fusal he is excommunicated from the Church, and I was not only not called before the Council but they did not even inform me that they would pass judgment on me, and without this formality the judgment is not valid.

Referring to the case, my opponents charge me with treason in that I used my authority for overthrowing the present system of our common life. I positively do not pretend to be so much a follower of the Soviets as the Church reformers of to-day headed by the highest church council present themselves as being, but I am not such an enemy of the Soviet government as they represent me to others. If in the first year of the existence of the Soviet government I was sometimes against that government, I did this because of my education in my youth and in pursuance of the arrangement which was made by the members of the Council at that time. But during the past years many things have changed and cleared up, and now, for instance, we are compelled to ask the Soviet government to undertake the defense of Orthodox Russians in Holmachina and Grodenschina, where the Polish Government is closing Orthodox churches.

Already in the beginning of 1919 I was trying to separate the Church from Czarism and intervention, and in September, 1919, I issued a proclamation of no intervention by the Church in political matters and to be subject to all orders of the Soviet government if they were not contrary to the faith. For this reason when we were informed that at the Karlovitz Council in November, 1921, the majority approved a resolution for the reestablishment of the Romanoff dynasty, we inclined to the minority, that the resolution was out of place. When in March, 1922, there was made known to us a proclamation of the Presidium of the highest church council abroad not to allow a Russian delegation to be admitted to the general conference, we abolished this council, which act was sanctioned by the Patriarch

of Constantinople. From this it is clear that I am not such an enemy of the Soviet government and not such a counter-revolutionist as the Council represents me to be.

All this I would have explained at the Council if they had only invited me, as they were supposed to do.

Generally, I can say nothing of praise or joy in regard to this council. First, the composition of the bishops seems to be strange. Out of 67 bishops who were present at the Council, I know only 10 or 15 persons. Where are the others? The canons of the 16th Constantinople Council declare that in a case when disturbances occur in God's church matters should be taken under consideration and there should not be any appointments to the vacant diocese when the bishops of the same are still alive and in their ranks. There should be a request made, and when the bishop is found guilty he should be deposed from his rank and another person can be appointed. But in our case one bishop was simply dismissed and another one was appointed often in place of being elected.

Second, in the last Sobor and in the present Plenum of the Supreme Church Council the members were and are only reformers, and besides in the executive diocesan offices there can be no members except the reformers (Exhibit 7) that is already compulsion by the Church. Who are the Church's reformers? The following was said about them in 1906 by a Russian writer and thinker, Basil Svenzitsky: "To-day's church movement can be called liberal Christianity, and liberal Christianity is only half truth. The soul which is divided into two parts, religious and secular, cannot be wholly the servant either of God or of the world. The results are only a half true warmly-cold liberal Christianity in which there is none of God's truth nor of men's truth either. Representatives of such Christianity are without religious enthusiasm, among them are no martyrs and no prophets, and the society of church

reformers is the first light of the coming bride of the Apocalypse clothed in the sun and is one of those many professional societies which are pretending to be what they are not."

Considering more closely what interested the reformers mostly, we cannot escape this fact, what they are tending toward. In the first place, comforts, ranks, and rewards, persons who are not agreeing with them, they are trying to expel. They create for themselves titles and positions, calling themselves Metropolitans of all Russia and Archpresbyters of all Russia. If they would only limit their capacity to the titles. But no. They are taking further and more serious steps. They introduce into the church a married Episcopacy and a twice-married priesthood and such practice is against the rules of the Trolsk Council. Our territorial Council has no right to bring about these reforms about communication with the Eastern Patriarchs and the excommunication of the persons who are opposed to these rules from the Church. But let us have confidence that among us according to the proclamation of the Eastern Patriarchs, "The protector of truth is the Church's body, that is the people," who will not recognize such rules of the last Sobor. Among the decisions the one introducing the new style of calendar in church practice can be approved and sanctioned. About that we asked the Patriarch of Constantinople in 1919. We had a petition concerning the reform of the calendar from the autonomous churches in Finnland and Esthonia. Concerning my relation to the Soviet government at the present time, I have already set forth my position before the Supreme Court. I now ask that court to free me from custody. In this crime in which I acknowledge my fault, the larger fault is that of the society which stirred me up to this and other active opposition as the head of the Orthodox Church against the Soviet Government. From to-day I make it known to all of these people that they will not succeed because

I decisively condemn any attack upon the Soviet Government, no matter from where it comes. Let it be known to all foreign and domestic monarchists, that I am not an enemy of the Soviet government. I am already acquainted with all the lies and falsehoods to which the Soviet Government is subjected. These lies are scattered by fellow citizens and foreigners throughout the world. They have not omitted even me from this matter. In the newspaper *Novoys Vremia* of May 5th was an article in which it was stated that during my examination by the Checka I was subject to electric torture. I declare that all this is an unfounded falsehood and a plain lie against the Soviet government. May the God of Peace and Love be with you.

PATRIARCH TIKHON,
June 28, 1923. Donskoy Monastery.

In times of confusion in Church and in the state many things are done which even good men may do but not wholly approve; many misunderstandings and moral complexes arise as the result of the interplay of petty jealousies, envyings, and crafty ambitions of pious schemers and of well-meaning but defective mentalities, but it is not conceivable, now that the truth is known, that Christian people will any longer indorse what in such circumstances and in the face of the whole Christian world is solemnly denounced as a fraud and a lie.

Another act solemn in its significance to such churches as the Russian, the Roman Catholic, and the High Anglican people of the

Church of England was that among the Patriarch's first official duties he sprinkled with holy water, according to church formula, the buildings in which the Council had held its meetings. This is a symbolic rite. It is an act of cleansing. It signifies that the building has been desecrated and must be purified or reconsecrated before it can be used again for divine worship. A suicide, a murder, or any crime of a vile or heinous character committed within the walls of a church demands this act of cleansing. In the nature of the case purification of the building implies the condemnation of the crime committed and of those involved. Such public manifestation of the Patriarch's authority gave proof of his undaunted spirit, of his profound religious conviction, and his utter condemnation in the light of all the people of the Council and its acts.

Later, as the responsible head of the Russian Church, he protested against the Roman Catholic Pope's proselyting activities among Orthodox Russians in Poland and charged him with causing many of their churches to be closed.

Such were his activities in pursuance of his duties. Such was the devotion shown him by the people.

The Living-Church group seemed to have become alarmed at his increasing popularity and to have found it necessary in consequence to reconcile their differences and present a united opposition. As is usual among such combinations of mixed motives, feuds and jealousies had broken out among these reformers. On the day that Tikhon was released from prison, Antonine was deprived by one group of his office as Metropolitan Bishop of Moscow. Another group desired later to unfrock Vedensky, the fiery orator, who had employed his brilliant powers in denouncing as worthy of the death penalty Benjamin, Bishop of Petrograd, and the Patriarch Tikhon.

The government having succeeded in dividing the Church and, as they thought, made it ridiculous in the eyes of the people because of its rivalries and incriminations, had no further use for the Living Church and manifested openly no particular favor toward either party.

"It may be possible," wrote Stepanoff, the editor of a Communistic organ in Moscow, "that one church will fight against another, but we must take no part. We must try to take the advantage of this collusion for revolutionizing the masses. . . . The Communistic

Party is in irreconcilable animosity to any religion of any church, and leads against them a merciless war of ideas for delivering the minds of the masses." Cartoons appeared in which representatives of the Church parties were shown struggling together, one on top of the other on the ground, with the legend, "When two are fighting, the third has his hands free."

Reconciliation or adjustment of differences among the conspirators and the adoption of a common platform in order that they might combat the increasing antagonism of the people and resist the Patriarch therefore became the necessity of the hour, for much was at stake.

Owing to the distracted condition of the Church and the danger of further inroads upon its solidarity, the Patriarch had promised in his first address after his release that when peace had again come to the Church, which was his immediate objective, he would call a General Convocation of the whole Church. Such an Assembly, if convened, will undoubtedly ignore the acts of the Living-Church Council and deprive its leaders of their assumed authority. Associated Press dispatches from Moscow in December, 1923, stated that the Patriarch had so far succeeded

in regaining control of the Church that the clergy who unfrocked him were making every effort to compromise with him. The Synod appointed by the Living-Church Council had also issued a call for an All-Russian Church Assembly in order, evidently, to forestall the Council the Patriarch had intended to convoke.

A prime necessity in every reform is that the leaders shall have the confidence of the people. This these reformists do not seem to have had. They were discredited by the faithful from the start because of their suspicious connection with the government. For, while the people themselves may not have been aggressively opposed to the Soviet form of government, they will always retain their village Soviets, they do not believe that priests who were willing agents of that government, with its record of persecution, are of such spiritual character that they could inaugurate a spiritual reformation, energize devotion, or command obedience.

The fact is that with the exception of Vedensky the leaders of the "Living Church" do not intend a reformation in doctrine and practice such as evangelical Protestants have been led to believe. The evidence is clear.

On Wednesday, July 25, 1923, the Supreme

Church Council, the Educational Committee, and representatives of the reformist clergy in Moscow held a special meeting in the Troitsky Monastery. Archpresbyter Krassnitsky presided. In the course of his speech reviewing the history of the reform movements in Russia, he said that it was not a political movement, "but a Church movement *with the unalterable* preservation of the dogmas of divine service." And in a published statement New York, September 7, 1923, the newly appointed archbishop, Kedrovsky, representing the Living-Church group in this country, declared, *"No departure from orthodoxy is to be considered for a moment nor any participation in any schismatic movement."*

These are authoritative declarations. There is no higher. The first was made by one of the foremost leaders of the Reformists in the presence of the "Living-Church" representatives in a special meeting. The second was made by the highest authority of the group in the United States on the eve of his departure for Moscow.

How intelligent Protestants, on the supposition that they are helping Russia, can contribute to the education of Russian priests of these groups in the same dogmas and practices with few exceptions as those of Rome and yet

oppose Roman dogmas and practices at home, is an interesting problem which can be solved only by concluding such contributors to be ignorant of the facts. Such an act is as inconsistent as indorsing the Soviet Communistic Government in Russia but condemning its agents and sympathizers in the United States whom the government has exposed and condemned. The professed goal in both, that is "the common good," is the same. Surely, a priestly struggle for supremacy, a mere change of bishops and Patriarchs, is a lame and impotent reason for a religious upheaval worthy to be considered a religious reformation.

Instead of furthering genuine reform in the Russian Church this movement called the "Living Church," if it should continue, will be more likely to drive thousands into the Church of Rome, as several congregations have already gone. Between two factions, one under the surveillance of the government, the other distrusted by the masses as legitimate priests, the truly religious element will drift Romeward with whose doctrines, rites, and practices they are already familiar.

Tikhon may be a reactionary; he may still prefer the old order, monarchy, and much that went with it, to the present disorder. He is

an old man, probably near decrepitude and sometimes confused in the whirl of the storm. Much of his life he has lived in a quiet social atmosphere, in a religious and cultural environment, as different from the present intellectual poverty, brutality, godlessness, universal degradation of the human spirit which the atheism of Communists has produced, as night is from day. But that he was indifferent to the need of reform, or that he is now opposed to a thorough house-cleaning, is directly contrary to the facts. He was too long in this country not to have been impressed with the scriptural character of evangelical Protestantism, the spirituality of its ministers, their effectual participation in all movements for social betterment, their intellectual strength, freedom, and recognized influence in the life of the people.

New York is not an altogether comfortable neighborhood for Ultra-Conservatists. In his contact for many years as Chief Pastor of the Russians and his daily observation of other foreign elements proud of their adopted country, though some with raucous voices, evil as those that Dante heard in Malaboge, may hiss the flag that shelters them, Tikhon must have felt that the world he had known was the world before the Flood, that in the larger

world of the present every institution incapable of adjustment to democracy is inevitably doomed.

Should the Patriarch live till the next Conclave, he will probably retire from the conflict. In the opinion of some he has not proved himself altogether strong enough to cope with the conflicting situation; nevertheless, despite his acceptance of political conditions, which was probably a wise conclusion for the sake of the Church, disappointing as it was to counter-revolutionaries safely removed in Berlin or London or Paris, he still commands the devotion of the people who are now returning to the churches served by the orthodox priests. But should the "Living-Church" reformists become desperate, seeing the failure of their cause, and both clergy and people return in large numbers to their former allegiance, it is probable that the government will again remove the Patriarch as the directing head of counter-revolutionary activities.

Communism as taught by Karl Marx, Nicolai Lenin, Leon Trotsky, and their party is incompatible with Christianity. There must ever be war or suspicion of war between them, and so far as liberty of practice either of Communism or of Christianity is curtailed by either, the one is as destructive of peace as the other.

There is one other probability and this is more probable than the others: the reformists will abandon their antagonism to Tikhon, make peace with him one by one, even Vedensky, the most vehement, and the leaders merging back into the mass of the clergy the Living Church as a distinct movement will finally fade away like a troubled dream when the morning breaks and the shadows flee away.

The future of the Russian Church, the future of religion in Russia cannot be in the hands of such men. It will be a tremendous task to evangelize the millions in that great land as it will be to bring liberty and prosperity to Russia, but the beneficent results to mankind will be as great as the task is laborious. Russia must be brought within the world of evangelical Protestantism as the nation itself must be included in the world of democracy.

CHAPTER VIII

OPINIONS

A CLOSED mind is the enemy of truth. No evidence demonstrable of any proposition is of any worth to him whose mind is barricaded against proof by an obdurate purpose to believe or not believe according to his wishes. Putting one's eyes out so he cannot see is the sin against the Holy Ghost. In matters of history this sin is not rare. Against all evidence to the contrary the old errors, prejudices and calumnies are repeated, and the efforts of conscientious historians to eliminate truth from untruth are sometimes well-nigh hopeless.

The evidence based upon reliable documents that the Soviet Church is altogether in its origin and its character different from what it has been represented will be of course denied and that only will be admitted which bolsters the claims of its Soviet sympathizers. It will be assumed that those only who have been in Russia and are familiar with its language are competent to understand the Soviet-Church movement, as if looking in shop windows or

gazing at some spectacular scene was necessary in order to penetrate the soul of a people, to enter into the life they experience, to feel the power of those mighty imponderable forces which inspire or destroy every high and holy impulse in their intellectual and moral development.

The assumption, therefore, that these leaders of the "Living Church" were true representatives of the Russian Church and were engaged in a spiritual regeneration which would change the character of the Church, that these were the key men to the door of Russia, and that it was God's providence that such an opportunity had come to the American people to save Russia, despite affirmations loud and strong to the contrary, rests upon shifting sand. Visions stretching far off into the future of the marvelous redemption of Russia, of a reformation like the epoch-making Reformation in the sixteenth century, through the agency of these reformers, may be indulged in by controversialists, but historical facts and cold criticism dissipate dreams and compel us to face realities.

That religious people who behold such visions are honest in their view; that they have deep conviction that they were touching realities and not flitting shadows produced by

others who also imagine what they invent is possible, is unquestionably true. It is this honest but misleading conviction that leads to a seeming defense of Bolshevism, while denying the charge; that leads further to a denial of religious persecution in Russia; and, further yet, to an impeachment of all who have better knowledge of the situation; and, finally, to substituting the phrase "Russian Church" for the "Living Church."

That there are sufficient grounds for such expectations of reform does not appear. There were no better reasons then than there are now. Professor P. Sorokin, author of important books, member of the Social-Revolutionist Party, active in the overthrow of the Tsarist government, a member of the Constitutional Assembly, formerly a professor of sociology in the University of Petrograd, a qualified authority it would seem to express judgment in the case, stated in The Christian Advocate of New York, foremost among the most carefully edited papers in America, that the Living Church is extremely unpopular in Russia. He writes:

Its influence is very weak and is based exclusively on the force of the "T'cheka" (State Polit. Department) and the Bolshevist party. The members and representatives of the Living Church are named in Russia: "Members of T'cheka," "Judases," "The Enemies of

the Christian Religion," etc. Every man who took part in religious gatherings in Petrograd and Moscow in 1922–23 saw and heard this.

The enmity has been reinforced by the personal qualities of the leaders of this "Living Church" on the one hand, and by its participation in the persecution of the orthodox clergymen and believers and by the forcible methods to convert the followers of this church, on the other. I know personally most of these leaders and must say frankly that only two of them are honest men. Others are men without any strong moral and religious principles; for example, Krassnitsky some years ago was one of the most reactionary priests, and, according to the desire of some of the Russian bureaucrats and autocrats, tried to prove in the trials of Beylis that the Jews in their religious ceremonies sacrifice men. As in the time of the Tsar he was Tsarist partisan, so during the Bolshevist dictatorship he is the most feverish Bolshevist admirer. The same may be said of most of the other leaders. All their activities are for the purpose of seeking material profit. All their pretentious phraseology is a veil beautifying this prosaic matter. To this we must add the participation of these leaders in the persecutions of religion by the Bolshevikis. Having no means of winning influence and power among the people honestly, they have begun to denounce to the "T'cheka" many clergymen and believers as "reactionaries"; to cause their imprisonment and punishment. As a result, beginning with the Metropolitan Benjamin of Petrograd, many men have been imprisoned and even executed. It can readily be seen that such activity could not arouse any sympathy for this church on the part of the Russian people. Besides, for the same purpose of winning influence and authority, the "Living Church" in union with the Soviet government began to dismiss, against the will of the people, all clergymen not in sympathy with it; to seize all church buildings of the parishes which had

no desire to recognize this church. This has more strongly reenforced the hostile feelings of the Russian people to it.

These are strong statements from a responsible source and are not to be lightly set aside.

However correct these views of Professor Sorokin may be, on the whole, it should be noted that relative to the fact of persecution of religion in Russia there can be no denial. Nor can any church look with indifference upon that awful tragedy. To pass over so unsympathetically the crimes of a persecuting and ruthless power, to forget the suffering caused, not merely to those who died for the best that was in them, but also to the thousands of their relatives, their wives, and children who were compelled to endure the agonies of separation and the hopeless poverty which must darken their days by merely disapproving the methods of the Bolsheviks is like apologizing for the thieves on the Jericho road and reproving the good Samaritan for interfering with their work. Is the goal of the Bolsheviks, the spread of Communism, even with all its imaginary but never realized benefits, worth the methods to obtain it—the torture, the imprisonment, and death? Does the end justify the means? Who will indorse the excuse of those pious murderers

who lighted the fires of martyrdom in other days in which thousands perished, on the plea that they burned the bodies of heretics in order to save their souls? To say that we merely disapprove of such methods of salvation may lead many in defiance to prefer missing that kind of salvation.

The seemingly pious opinion entertained by some that it is the duty of the Church to align itself with a government which would spread death and destruction in every land in order to realize a false economic dream which, if possible of realization, would reduce the world to the present impoverished condition of Russia, evidences more sympathy for Bolshevism and the imaginary victims of capital, than clear apprehension of the results of such thinking if such should become effectual in the Christian Church.

The serious question is how such opinions may be understood abroad, how such opinions may be interpreted by the Bolsheviks in Moscow, by the Council, by the Allies of the Bolsheviks, the I. W. W.'s, the Communists and radical Socialists in the United States whose aims and policies are identical with the Moscow Reds? Extending the hands in benediction over Soviets in Moscow and in anathema on the heads of "Big Bill" Haywood, Eastman,

Berkman, and other "undesirables" in the United States, is apt to blunt the edge of moral sensibility and to create some slight confusion in our ordinary conceptions of logical consistency.

The declaration often made by Bolsheviks and their leaders, words often used by Lenin and Trotsky, that for the first time in history a political government (Bolshevism) has been created for the benefit of the common people is, of course, without any historical foundation whatsoever.

Almost every detail in the practical working of Karl Marx's theory in Moscow may be found in the Communist's state in Peru when that country was first visited by the Spaniards in the sixteenth century. Should one read the eminent English philosopher, Mr. Herbert Spencer's account of it in the Contemporary Review, September, 1881, he would think that he was reading a recent description of the system enforced by the Soviet government. The Incas community was divided into groups. Over each group were officers who exacted so much work, and over these officers were set spies who reported their doings. The public and private life of the people was regulated according to schedule. All the inhabitants were forced to labor for the common good.

The state owned everything, the individual nothing. The whole system was based on subordination of the individual will to the state will—just as we have seen in the militarized state in Russia. The result of it all was such an enfeebling of the people in the virtues of independence and self-reliance that in the crisis of their existence they fell easy victims to the Spaniards under Pizzaro.

Americans are not likely to forget Abraham Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg, the sublimest speech in fewest words that was ever delivered by mortal man. This government of the United States, he declared, is "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Unlike the Communist's government at Moscow, which is for one class of people only, unless all classes are merged into that one common class, the United States government is for the whole people, rich and poor, proletariat and bourgeoise, if any as such exist among us, while the Soviet government is not, and, according to its oligarchic system, never can be.

In 1848, the French Revolutionary government attempted a similar experiment "for the common people." It nationalized the workshops, that is, it subsidized them for the benefit

of the working class. In a short time it was discovered that this same theory now played with by the Moscow Revolutionary government, either enslaved the workers by enforcing laws of compulsory labor, just as the Soviet government has enacted, or transformed the industrious workers of France into a wasteful, unproductive host of idlers. This was not the only effect. French securities dropped in value, the loss rising to hundreds of millions of dollars, and every piece of property in France suffered proportionate loss. The economic results of this theory in trade, commerce, and in the life of the toiling masses were so disastrous that the people turned from the Utopian dreams of Communistic demagogues and opened the way to the election of Louis Napoleon and the resulting empire, the defeat of the French at Sedan in 1870, the change of Germany from an industrial policy and the World War. The history of every attempt to introduce Communism adopted by the disciples of Karl Marx has ended, as this of Moscow must inevitably end, in dismal failure.

Nor is this Soviet government, which is an exacting taskmaster, ruthless and uncompromising in its dictatorship, a free government. It has, however, the virtue of candor, it does

not profess to be. Lenin, the president, frankly declared:

> Just as 150,000 lordly landowners dominated the 180,000,000 of Russian peasants, so 200,000 members of the Bolshevik party are imposing their proletarian will on the mass.

And he goes on to say:

> The principal aim of the constitution of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic in the present transitory period is to establish the dictatorship of the city and rural proletariat and of the poorest elements of the peasantry in the form of a powerful all-Russian soviet government for the purpose of completely suppressing the capitalistic class.

There has been no free election in Russia under the government of the Bolsheviks; nor would the dictators submit to the result if such an election were possible, if they were outvoted. There can be no free election where there is no free speech, free press, free assembly of the people. The Moscow government knows that it governs solely by force, that it is not the choice of free people; that it is a government without credentials, a government whose signature to any treaty or to any obligation is not worth the paper it is written on. It may be questioned whether any future government in Russia can be legally held responsible for the acts of such a government. The

Soviets themselves insist that they are not responsible for debts due under the Tsarist government to foreign countries. They have no more legality than the acts of a band of successful bandits in China. The Russian people cannot be held responsible for any loans or other financial transactions which the Bolshevik may obtain in any country, and it is sheer caricature of statesmanship to force by mere political majority for selfish reasons recognition of a government which has no recognition from its own people. For the sake of employment for nearly two million of her people now England will recognize Russia and force collection of debts later on.

The fact that free speech, free press, free discussion is prohibited and is made a crime against the government is sufficient evidence that the government at Moscow is not a legitimate government, the choice of a free people. Up to July, 1923, there were 72,682 political prisoners in Central Russia and the majority of these belonged to the working class. In the recent elections of local Soviets the non-partisan (as such for safety) voters expressed the dissatisfaction of the people, but the power of the dictators cannot be weakened, since the system keeps the supreme power beyond the reach of the people. In the Moscow Province

elections held in the autumn of 1923, 6,911 non-partisan candidates were elected against 467 Communists, 232 Young Communists and 1 Anarchist. But while this indicates the drift of the popular mind and may presage revolution in the future if the people can obtain arms and ammunition which they are now deprived of, it is as far as the people can go—at this point they have reached the end of their chain.

No such government can long endure, nor can its results be other than harmful, nor can its final goal, which it is declared would be beneficial, be other than destructive of civilization. According to the report (1919) of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee United States Congress, the program of the Soviet government of Moscow is

The abolition of the Sunday school and all other schools and institutions that teach religion.

The absolute separation of churches and schools.

The establishment, through marriage and divorce laws, of a method for the legalization of prostitution, when the same is engaged in by consent of the parties.

The refusal to recognize the existence of God in its governmental and judicial proceedings.

The conferring of the rights of citizenship on aliens without regard to length of residence or intelligence.

The arming of all so-called "toilers," and the disarming of all persons that had succeeded in acquiring property.

The discrimination in favor of residents of cities and

against residents of the rural districts through giving residents of cities five times as much voting power as is accorded to residents of rural districts in such elections as are permitted.

The disfranchisement of all persons employing any other person in connection with their business.

The disfranchisement of all persons receiving rent, interest, or dividends.

The disfranchisement of all merchants, traders, and commercial agents.

The disfranchisement of all priests, clergymen, or employees of churches and religious bodies.

The denial of the existence of any inalienable rights in the individual citizen.

The establishment of a judicial system exercising autocratic power, convicting persons and imposing penalties in their absence, and without opportunity to be heard, and even adopting the death penalty for numerous crimes and misdemeanors.

The inauguration of a reign of fear, terrorism, and violence.

The affirmation thus that the Church of God should support such a government with such principles and such methods, without which it could not exist, cannot be seriously intended to mean other than that the Church should assist in ameliorating social conditions, which is, of course, the belief of all Christians and a mere commonplace in sociological discussions in every church.

Everyone has the right to his personal opinion concerning the recognition of the Soviet government by the United States—and

one may insist that that government is as well established as any government in Europe—which yet remains to be seen—and that it is both politically and morally wrong to deprive the Russian people of the benefits which would result to them in the development of trade and commerce, which, of course, nonrecognition does not prevent, since Russian traders and importers have had and now have such relations with English and American commercial agencies. But it is hardly conceivable that any Church would go so far as commit itself to any political or economic program in Soviet Russia. Nothing clearer can be stated concerning the recognition of the Soviet government by the United States than the letter of the Secretary of State, the Hon. Charles E. Hughes, dated Washington, July 19, 1923, in reply to an inquiry of Mr. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, which is here inserted not for the specific reasons it gives for the attitude of the United States government toward the Soviet government, which is not the Russian people, but in order that an intelligent understanding of the character of such a government controlling the Russian Church may be had from the viewpoint of the exact knowledge in the possession of the State Department:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE
Washington
July 19, 1923

MY DEAR MR. GOMPERS:

I have your letter of the ninth instant with respect to the grounds upon which the recognition of the present regime in Russia has been withheld.

You refer with just emphasis to the tyrannical exercise of power by this regime. The seizure of control by a minority in Russia came as a grievous disappointment to American democratic thought, which had enthusiastically acclaimed the end of the despotism of the Czars and the entrance of free Russia into the family of democratic nations. Subsequent events were even more disturbing. The right of free speech and other civil liberties were denied. Even the advocacy of those rights which are usually considered to constitute the foundation of freedom was declared to be counter-revolutionary and punishable by death. Every form of political opposition was ruthlessly exterminated. There followed the deliberate destruction of the economic life of the country. Attacks were made not only upon property in its so-called capitalistic form, but recourse was had also to the requisitioning of labor. All voluntary organizations of workers were brought to an end. To unionize or strike was followed by the severest penalties. When labor retaliated by passive resistance, workmen were impressed into a huge labor army. The practical effect of this program was to plunge Russia once more into mediævalism. Politically there was ruthless despotism and economically the situation was equally disastrous.

It is true that, under the pressure of the calamitous consequences, the governing group in Russia has yielded certain concessions. The so-called new economic policy permitted a partial return to economic freedom. The termination of forcible requisitions of grain has induced the peasantry to endeavor to build up production

once more and favorable weather conditions have combined to increase the agriculture output. How far the reported exports of Russian grain are justified by the general economy of the country is at least an open question. Manufacturing industry has to a great extent disappeared. The suffrage, so far as it may be exercised, continues to be limited to certain classes, and even among them the votes of some categories count more than the votes of others. A new constitution has just now been promulgated providing in effect for the continuance of the regime of the 1917 *coup d'état* under a new title. The Constitution, it is understood, contains no bill of rights, and the civil liberties of the people remain insecure. There is no press except the press controlled by the regime, and the censorship is far-reaching and stringent. Labor is understood to be still at the mercy of the state. While membership in official unions is no longer obligatory, workmen may not organize or participate in voluntary unions.

The fundamentals of the Russian situation are pretty generally understood in the United States and have made a profound impression upon the thought of our people. We are constantly made aware of this in the Department of State by the various ways in which public opinion makes itself felt in the seat of government. We learn of the hope of America that Russia should have the opportunity of free political expression and that she should be enabled to restore her economic life and regain prosperity and once more to take her place among the nations on the basis of mutual helpfulness and respect. There can be no question of the sincere friendliness of the American people toward the Russian people. And there is for this very reason a strong desire that nothing should be done to place the seal of approval on the tyrannical measures that have been adopted in Russia or to take any action which might retard the gradual reassertion of the Russian people of their right to live in freedom.

To the Department of State, charged with the conduct of our foreign relations, in accordance with the accepted principles of international intercourse, the problem presents itself necessarily in somewhat less general terms. We are not concerned with the question of the legitimacy of a government as judged by former European standards. We recognize the right of revolution and we do not attempt to determine the internal concerns of other States. The following words of Thomas Jefferson, in 1793, express a fundamental principle: "We surely cannot deny to any nation that right whereon our own Government is founded—that everyone may govern itself according to whatever form it pleases, and change these forms at its own will; and that it may transact its business with foreign nations through whatever organ it thinks proper, whether king, convention, assembly, committee, president, or anything else it may choose. The will of the nation is the only thing essential to be regarded." It was undoubtedly this principle which was invoked by the representative of the Department of State, in the statement which you quote as having been made in February, 1921, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the consideration of House Resolution 635, 66th Congress, 3d Session. It must be borne in mind, however, that while this government has laid stress upon the value of expressed popular approval in determining whether a new government should be recognized, it has never insisted that the will of the people of a foreign State may not be manifested by long continued acquiescence in a regime actually functioning as a government. When there is a question as to the will of the nation it has generally been regarded as a wise precaution to give sufficient time to enable a new regime to prove its stability and the apparent acquiescence of the people in the exercise of the authority it has assumed. The application of these familiar principles, in dealing with foreign States, is not in derogation of the democratic

ideals cherished by our people, and constitutes no justification of tyranny in any form, but proceeds upon a consideration of the importance of international intercourse and upon the established American principle of nonintervention in the internal concerns of other peoples.

But while a foreign regime may have securely established itself through the exercise of control and the submission of the people to, or their acquiescence in its exercise of, authority, there still remain other questions to be considered. Recognition is an invitation to intercourse. It is accompanied on the part of the new government by the clearly implied or express promise to fulfill the obligations of intercourse. These obligations include, among other things, the protection of the persons and property of the citizens of one country lawfully pursuing their business in the territory of the other and abstention from hostile propaganda by one country in the territory of the other. 'In the case of the existing regime in Russia, there has not only been the tyrannical procedure to which you refer, and which has caused the question of the submission or acquiescence of the Russian people to remain an open one, but also a repudiation of the obligations inherent in international intercourse and a defiance of the principles upon which alone it can be conducted.

The persons of our citizens in Russia are for the moment free from harm. No assurance exists, however, against a repetition of the arbitrary detentions which some of them have suffered in the past. The situation with respect to property is even more palpable. The obligations of Russia to the taxpayers of the United States remain repudiated. The many American citizens who have suffered directly or indirectly by the confiscation of American property in Russia remain without the prospect of indemnification. We have had recent evidence, moreover, that the policy of confiscation is by no means at an end. The effective ju-

risdiction of Moscow was recently extended to Vladivostok, and soon thereafter Moscow directed the carrying out in that city of confiscatory measures such as we saw in Western Russia during 1917 and 1918.

What is most serious is that there is conclusive evidence that those in control at Moscow have not given up their original purpose of destroying existing governments wherever they can do so throughout the world. Their efforts in this direction have recently been lessened in intensity only by the reduction of the cash resources at their disposal. You are well aware from the experiences of the American Federation of Labor of this aspect of the situation which must be kept constantly in view. I had occasion to refer to it last March in addressing the Women's Committee for the Recognition of Russia. It is worth while to repeat the quotations which I then gave from utterances of the leaders of the Bolshevik government on the subject of world revolution, as the authenticity of these has not been denied by their authors. Last November Zinoviev said, "The eternal in the Russian revolution is the fact that it is the beginning of the world revolution." Lenin, before the last Congress of the Third Internationale, last fall, said that "the revolutionists of all countries must learn the organization, the planning, the method, and the substance of revolutionary work." "Then, I am convinced," he said, "the outlook of the world revolution will not be good but excellent." And Trotsky, addressing the Fifth Congress of the Russian Communist Youths at Moscow last October—not two years ago but last October—said this: "That means, comrades, that revolution is coming in Europe as well as in America, systematically, step by step, stubbornly and with gnashing of teeth in both camps. It will be long-protracted, cruel, and sanguinary."

The only suggestion that I have seen in answer to this portrayal of a fixed policy is that these statements express the views of the individuals in control of the

Moscow regime rather than of the regime itself. We are unable, however, to find any reason for separating the regime, and its purpose from those who animate it, and control it, and direct it so as to further their aims. Unaltered the question of recognition by our government of the authorities at Moscow cannot be determined by mere economic considerations or by the establishment in some degree of a more prosperous condition, which, of course, we should be glad to note, or simply by a consideration of the probable stability of the regime in question. There cannot be intercourse among nations any more than among individuals except upon a general assumption of good faith. We would welcome convincing evidence of a desire of the Russian authorities to observe the fundamental conditions of international intercourse and the abandonment by them of the persistent attempts to subvert the institutions of democracy as maintained in this country and in others. It may confidently be added that respect by the Moscow regime for the liberties of other peoples will most likely be accompanied by appropriate respect for the essential rights and liberties of the Russian people themselves. The sentiment of our people is not deemed to be favorable to the acceptance into political fellowship of this regime so long as it denies the essential basis of intercourse and cherishes, as an ultimate and definite aim, the destruction of the free institutions which we have laboriously built up, containing as they do the necessary assurances of the freedom of labor upon which our prosperity must depend.

I am, my dear Mr. Gompers,

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) CHARLES E. HUGHES.

The Church of God can never be the servant of politics. It is neither a political institution nor a political agent. It cannot interfere

in partisan interests, with government duties, policies or purposes, foreign or domestic. The idea of mixing partisan political affairs with religious affairs is absolutely contrary to its principles. Its politics is the gospel of Christ.

The conclusions thus far reached in these pages based upon trustworthy documents, and equally reliable authorities, may now be summarized as follows:

1. That the Holy Orthodox Church in Russia and its leaders were regarded as the enemies of the Bolshevik government.

2. That there was continuous bloody persecution of its priests and bishops in Russia.

3. That in order to bring the Church into harmony with the government certain clergymen seized control of the Church and represented themselves as legitimate leaders of the Church.

4. That dissensions having arisen between these ministers they organized various groups, such as "the Living-Church Group," the "Church of Regeneration," the "Apostolic," etc.

5. That contrary to the canons of the Church of which they professed to be lawful bishops and priests, they introduced new doctrines, and committed both themselves and the Church to Communism as an article of belief

to be defended by Christians everywhere, and to the program of the Bolsheviks to impose this doctrine upon all other governments and people.

Such is the net result.

CHAPTER IX

FUTURE

PERHAPS it was Shelley who wrote, "The Crescent of Mohammed rose; it shall set, and the Star of Bethlehem shall lead the generations on." European politics, that is England's secret support of the Greeks and France's encouragement of the Turks, resulting in the defeat of the Greeks and the return of the Turk to Europe, politics and jealousies which in effect endanger the future of Christ's kingdom in the East for the sake of the oil wells of Mesopotamia, may defer for indefinite time the fulfillment of the poet's prophecy. But what he wrote of the Crescent and the Star may now be applied with a measure of certainty to the conflict between atheism and religion in Russia. Whatever may be affirmed of the Church, its past or present condition, religion in Russia is not dead, nor is it likely to die in the near future.

For a time, as we have seen, anti-religious forces exercised repressive measures, but the ominous criticism of civilized governments whose recognition the Soviets covet operated

as a check. The collapse of their economical theories, their utter failure in political affairs, both at home and abroad, compelled retreat, while the stubborn resistance of the peasantry against further persecution of the Church suggested moderation in their anti-religious frenzy. The war against religion, however, has not yet fully reached the armistice stage. It still manifests itself in many places and in many ways. But governmental antagonism is waning. That crass materialism upon which the Soviets imagined they could build a strong and prosperous nation not only without God but even against him, has proved to be a pitiable delusion. "The stars in their courses fought against Sisera." Atheism *versus* Universe is a lost game before the play begins. The material must surrender to the spiritual, for, at bottom, the universe is spiritual, and Moscow with all of its straw burnings, thinking that smoke will obliterate the stars, will give way to religion, just as its Communistic theories with all their filigree will finally surrender to the demands of the world on a capitalistic basis.

Revolutions are always strong at the beginning. They originate in unity and fight for principles; they end in parties and the struggle for place. This course national up-

heavals take, and the Revolution in Russia will be no exception. The Moscow government carries within itself the dynamite for its destruction. The rift between Lenin, Trotsky, Zinovieff, Dizerskinsky, and other leaders of Bolshevism, in Warsaw in 1920, has been widened since Lenin's death. Trotsky is no longer a dominating figure. He finds it convenient to retire from Moscow, and it is not likely that the downfall of the others will be long delayed. Opposed to the economic laws of modern civilization, which, if bad, might be worse, conscious of the enmity of millions of the people who will yet overthrow it and of the distrust of all nations, it cannot endure. Sovietism as a form of government already familiar, may continue, but Communism as a governing principle will not abide.

With the passing of a Communism resting upon an atheistic foundation religion will rise again. Russia is religious. No one familiar with Russian life as told by travelers or churchmen who know the people and are acquainted with their spiritual leaders, or has attended church services in this country among the farming element in the Northwest, or is acquainted with the educated in the larger cities, will doubt the religious character of the Russian. To him the Church is

not, as the Russian theologian Khomiakoff said of rationalistic Protestantism, "A society of good men differing in their opinions but earnestly seeking for truth with a certainty that it has not been found and with no hope ever to find it." (*Russia and the English Church,* page 40.) On the contrary, to him it is "the pillar and ground of truth." He may swing for a time to the other extreme, plunging headlong into atheism, if he abandons the Church, for that is the only symbol of religion he knows, but even while openly in revolt he will be very likely to steal silently into a nearby church if only to see whether the little lamp is still burning before the sanctuary.

It is well known that no one can be a Communist who belongs to the Church. But so deeply imbedded is religion in the hearts of the people that the Communist Party which controls the Moscow regime, is not at all certain of the atheism even of its members. Says a writer in the *Pravda,* the official organ of the party, November 10, 1923:

"Even among us Communists, not mentioning nonpartisans, in many families of Bolsheviki are to be found at every step icons; mothers raising their children, imbuing them with religious feelings. The members of the

party themselves very often receive the nuptial benediction from a priest, christen their children, celebrate the Church's holy days."

At one meeting of the Communist nucleus the question about the new way of life arose, and this is what was cleared up, reproducing almost verbatim the answers of members of the party about icons.

" 'One day I wanted to take the icons off the wall,' says one, 'but by my wife took me by the hair.' 'Stop,' says she, 'you don't believe, but I do. Have you any right to destroy faith?' I retreated. The icons were left in the corner."

Others followed:

"We issued a decree to remove icons from public institutions. Let there be a decree to remove them from private houses. Thus, the question will be settled quickly."

"Why do members of our party, often even educated ones, observe the Church's holy days? This means that something is wrong here. They say that science will dissipate this dizziness, but we don't see it."

" 'The neighbors are evil,' says a fourth one. 'As soon as my wife begins to take off icons from the wall it starts. Neighbors seeing this, begin to quarrel and to such a degree that one has to go away. Let all members of the party

have their own apartments. Then it will be different. But as long as there are some fanatical neighbors, women especially, it is impossible to live without icons. They will peck you to death like crows.' "

" 'You have intentionally brought up the questions about icons,' growls an old Communist, a member of a suburban committee, while his eyebrows move up and down; he cannot look you straight in the face. He also has icons. 'My wife, you see, is a religious woman. Let her have them. It is nothing. She lives by herself, and I by myself.'

" 'And why did you walk with her to church to sanctify her Easter cakes?' laughs another. . . .

" 'And how did you christen your son—by a priest?' answered the offended old man.

"So it goes on without end. The old way is strong. It is deeply rooted in our life."

Atheism is emptiness. There is in it no constructive principle. It would not be atheism if there were. It is negation, the eternal spirit of denial, destructive, not constructive. It cannot build, for it has no motive to build. It has no future, being bounded by sense and time. It is earth-bound, limited to the material. If it should attempt to rise higher, it is no longer atheism, for rational thinking per-

ceives that if there is no God to love and adore there can be no conceivable reason in the nature of things why it should rise above the material. Should those professing such insanity conform to their environment, that is to the civilization about them, which not their unbelief but the ages of faith have created, they do so at the expense of their principles, for they affirm in practice what they deny in theory. Atheism is always at war with itself, always chaotic, always self-contradictory. There can be no definite worth-while purpose in art, in literature or in science if such expressions of the spirit are not informed with an inspiration which lifts man, "letting the ape and the tiger die," above the sensuous and the temporal to the realization within himself of those ideals which, like the Star of Bethlehem alluring Wise Men from the East, draw us to the ultimate goal of all art, science, literature and philosophy, the Christ of the ages. There are no atheists among world leaders, no Raphaels nor Angelos, Beethovens nor Mozarts, nor dreamers of heavenly harmonies in sculptured stone; nor do we find apostles of atheism among master minds in philosophy or in politics who create epochs in thought or in history by the splendor of their genius and their faith in the Eternal.

Russian atheism is a coarse, vulgar thing, a worn-out garment, full of holes, which decency is ashamed to wear. For such reasons atheism cannot live in Russia any longer than it has anywhere else. Life must be lived, and neither national prosperity nor scientific progress can satisfy the souls of the masses. Man cannot live on bread alone.

Without doubt religion in Russia will present another aspect in the future from that pagan appearance it has had in the past. Of all the liturgical churches the Russian is the most elaborate in its public services, resembling more the pomp of ancient heathenism on state occasions than the simplicity of the early Church.

There is a mighty power in solemn ritual over the human spirit, subduing and deepening it in adoration of the Eternal Mysteries, but when it is overdone it loses its spiritual quality, becomes materialistic and falls away among works of the flesh, profitless and inane. The desire for reform which the experience of the past six years has created will also eliminate many superstitious practices which have crept in during the centuries and become incorporated in the devotional life of the people: the veneration of icons and the relics of saints; pilgrimages to shrines; worship of

the Virgin Mother of our Lord; of saints and angels, which hair-splitting theology may invent, and much also of the Order for the Burial of the Dead in which the living and the dead engage in dialogue. These and other matters—matters that are novel, unscriptural, and offensive to intelligent belief in the revelation of God—will surely be subjects of serious criticism if they are not altogether expelled from the thought and practice of a Church that would deliver itself from the bondage of tradition.

Further change need not be expected. Even should this much be realized, it will denote a remarkable change in the mentality of the Russian people. Ancient beliefs and religious practices die hard. They often persist long after new beliefs have crowded them to the rear, as we see in China and Japan notwithstanding the adoption of the telegraph, the electric light, and the trolley car. The gods survive though their temples decay. The tyranny of antiquity over religious beliefs retards progress in the realm of religion, and dogma, therefore, does not always keep pace with the developments of science. The civilized countries of Europe, observes Professor Bury, "spent about three hundred years in passing from the mental atmosphere of the

Middle Ages into the mental atmosphere of the modern world."

The idea that the Orthodox Church of Russia with a thousand years of Christianity behind it, a millennium of missionary labors and spiritual conquest over barbarous tribes and nations inhabiting that vast territory stretching from the shores of the Black Sea to the Arctic Ocean, and from the borders of Persia and Afghanistan to the Bering Straits, will discard at once its inherited beliefs and embrace the distinctive tenets of Protestantism, of whatever variety, is an empty notion. No one expects the Roman Church to do so, nor will the Russian Church.

The Church of Russia in communion with the Holy Eastern Orthodox Church claims to be the one true and faithful Church of Christ which alone holds and teaches in its purity "the faith once delivered to the saints." In possession of unalterable truth it looks with pity upon the Church of Rome and the various Protestant churches as so many departures from the true faith of the gospel. Its teachings are fixed and unchangeable. Since no article of belief contrary to the decrees of the Ecumenical Councils which once for all defined orthodox teaching can be altered by any lesser authorities, the drastic doctrinal

reforms suggested by "Living-Church" leaders must mean, if they have any real meaning, either an intention to organize another Church and call it the "Russian Church," or simply to lop off the barnacles which have attached themselves to the Church in the course of her history.

The reply of the Eastern Patriarchs to the Encyclical of Pius IX (1848) which was translated and published by the Church authorities, according to W. J. Birbeck, the recognized English authority of that time on the Russian Church, is proof sufficient as to the unalterable character of Russian dogma. The reply was drawn up and signed at a Synod held at Constantinople by three Patriarchs and twenty-eight bishops. It declared:

> With us neither Patriarch nor Council could introduce anything new, for the guardian of religion with us is the body itself, that is to say, the people of the Church.

This is the position of the theologian Androustsos Macarius, also the *Encyclical* of 1896, the Synod of 1872, and the official *Encyclical* of 1902.

The Russian Church does not recognize the ministers of the Church of England any more than it does those of the Presbyterian or other

Protestant churches as truly ordained ministers of the Lord, nor its sacraments as instruments of divine grace. Should the High-Church Party which already recognize the decrees of six Ecumenical Councils succeed in eliminating Protestant doctrines from the formularies of the Church of England, as they endeavor to do, or so interpret them that they will no longer be held as professions of faith or belief, but only as historical documents drawn up in a time of controversy, it is not improbable, since so many contacts have been made with the Russian Church by the archbishops, the bishops and visiting clergy of the English Church since the days of the Stuart kings, and especially in recent years, that, in view of changed conditions in Russia, if the Church should affiliate with any Church, it would be the Church of England.

But closer approach than now exists is hardly probable. And yet so eager is the Anglican Church to satisfy the Eastern Church of the validity of its Orders, which the Church of Rome refuses to recognize, it will go far to prove its Catholicity in faith and practice despite acts of Parliaments and decisions of Privy Councils.

On the other hand, it is hardly conceivable that a Church which for a thousand years has

been so intertwined with the political and social life of the nation and has so deeply penetrated the soul of a great people, being in a large sense the source of their sipiritual life and the inspiration of their intellectual development, will so far estrange itself from the past, from the thought, the customs, the affections, and the religious needs of millions by such radical reform of its doctrines and usages as would reconcile it to Protestant thought and belief, and yet claim to be the ancient Orthodox Church of Russia.

But the solution of the difficulty should union of these two churches be seriously considered is not relevant here. What is relevant, and of immediate import as affecting the future, is: In view of the admitted fact that there can be no radical change in doctrine or discipline of the Russian Church, except in minor local matters, with what understanding did "The Living-Church" Council accept financial aid from Protestant sources for the education of Russian priests? This is the question. Bishop Antonine, who was in that Council and was the founder of the Living Church, declares that no change in doctrine or practice is contemplated. Bishop Kedrovsky, the representative of these reformists in the United States, as we have seen, made similar

declaration in public statement. Other reformists, while indulging in generalities, fail to state what particular reforms are to be introduced, whether they are of a doctrinal nature, or devotional, or such only as pertain merely to church government and ministerial education.

In all Christian candor it is of prime importance to Protestants that there should be a clear and very definite understanding of what is the purpose of these reforming groups relative to reform. Before financial aid in helpful amount should be given or asked, it should be stated unequivocally for what precise purpose the money is collected. Is it the intention of those accepting monetary assistance to educate ministerial candidates in the ancient doctrines and practices of the Orthodox Church, or in the doctrines of the Reformation Churches? Do they intend to repudiate the doctrine of transubstantiation, or transmutation of the bread and wine into the real body and blood of our Lord in the Lord's Supper? Do they intend to discontinue the invocation of saints, the prayers for the dead, the veneration of relics, the worship of the Virgin Mary under any form, and to reject the whole theological system underlying these novelties and corruptions of the Christian

faith? Obviously, if such be their intention, they have no moral right to declare themselves to be the "Orthodox Church of Russia," or even to be members of it. To represent themselves as the "Russian Church" when, in fact, they are but a mere handful, or to drop the title "The Living Church" and assume the title "The Orthodox Church" when they are nothing but a "group," is what some people might regard as sailing under false colors.

If they do not intend to do away with these innovations, to do which would at once separate them from the communion of the Eastern Orthodox Church, then the only reformation that they can intend is a cleansing of the Church from priestcraft, miracle-working relics of the saints, absurd superstitions, the abolishment of monasteries and the substitution for the present kind of instruction a more modern education of the clergy. This, indeed, would be a needed reformation and would not involve separation from the Eastern Church. In such case these reformers would hold an analogous relation to the Russian Church as the High Church, or the Anglo-Catholic Party, does to the Church of England, in it but not of it.

But it is not easy to discover just what the extent of the intended reformation will be,

nor does it appear that the reformists are agreed as to this among themselves. At the opening of the Theological Academy in Moscow in December, 1923, toward the maintenance of which Protestant money was contributed, no definite program or procedure for reform, no declaration of doctrinal principles were outlined. The *Izvestia* of December 2, reporting the opening, omitted every reference to such, if any had been made. It simply states:

In his speech, Metropolitan Euodokim remembered that for twelve years he had been Inspector and Rector of the Clerical Academy of Moscow, which "died" seven years ago, and it seems to be the hand of fate for him now to open a new one. He also confessed that as a Rector of the ancient Academy and clerical censor, though called a liberal, he was the "grave digger" of the professors' writings, as following the requests of his time, he was obliged to "bury" them. He is remembering this now, with great sorrow, and begs the Academy to "bury" his old self, and promises to stand firmly on the defense of the New Free Church.

Bishop George draws the attention of the assembly to the most important and live questions of the New Free Church—the question of Christ, and the task of bringing to a mutual agreement Faith, Reason, and Freedom.

Professor, the Reverend Krassotin, remarked that the old Academy perished because of its servitude and slavery of the mighties of this world, and the new Academy must be a free one.

Professor, the Reverend Popoff, spoke of the well-known Professors Gorni and Golybinsky, who were

against the Patriarch idea, and the Moscow Metropolitan Philaret expressed his wishes of a union with the American Episcopal Church with the acknowledgment of the six sacraments and the six Ecumenical Assemblies. He had spoken on this subject with the representative of his church, Mr. Young, 1904, when the latter came to Russia from America.

The representative of the American (Methodist) Episcopal Church, Doctor of Sociology and Philosophy, Hecker, spoke: "I am not a member of the clergy, but still a link between East, West, and America. In America at the present time, as well as in every part of the world, there is fermentation. Soviet Russia is for us Americans the guiding star; it is hope! And your Academy must be a School of Prophets, for not only Russia but the whole of the world. This is why she must have an international importance, disregarding the modesty of this meeting. And her motto must be 'Know the truth, and the truth will give you freedom.'"

Secretary of the Synod, Novikoff, read the letter of greetings of the absent Archbishop Vedensky, who said that "The old Academy kept away, far from real life, and the new one must come to it as nearly as possible, concentrating all its attention to its Christianity."

Clearly, from such generalities upon such an occasion when some definite declaration of reformation principles would certainly be expected, nothing satisfactory can be inferred. Not one of the theological teachers had a word concerning reform in the church, which is the one important subject the religious world is interested in, except what may be implied or read into the statement of Metropolitan Philarete relating to union with another church.

As for the Rev. Mr. Hecker, who declared himself to be "a link between the East and West and America," whatever that means, it must be concluded that this Theological Academy for which this money was contributed is to furnish a theology adapted to Marxian teaching for a Communistic clergy, as astronomy, for instance, according to the Program of the Proletarian culture adopted by the "All-Russian Conference of Cultural and Instructive Proletarian Sovieties," September, 1918, must be adapted to the proletarian view, "teaching the orientation in space and time of the efforts of labor," to which teaching, no doubt, the sun, moon, and stars will also adapt themselves.

Whatever may have been the understanding, or the implications, it is evident that in some important respects the Church of Russia has failed. It has not stood the test. By reason of its false teachings, notwithstanding it has had the Bible in its hands, it has brought the divine character of Christianity itself into question among the educated classes, many of whom renounce religion altogether, since they know it only as they have seen it in the Church. This is the verdict of its history. It would seem, therefore, to be the duty of Protestant Churches to extend their missionary labors to Russia not for the purpose

of antagonizing or supplanting the Orthodox Church, but in order to evangelize with or without its cooperation the millions of Russia within and outside the Church.

If past developments of humanity suggest any conclusion, it is that unless some now inconceivable reaction to the trend of evolution through countless ages intervenes, democracy under some form will be the future political status of Russia. "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Revolution, whether sudden or progressive, may yet again be a furnace through which Russia will have to pass, but whatever the experience democracy is the goal. Humanity is headed that way.

But democracy is not merely a form of government. It is not a political guarantee against bad government. Government is the collective will of the people, and in the long run the people get that kind of government which on the whole is the expression of their character. As the people are, so will be their institutions. Democracy in practical life never is, but always to be. As a goal of social endeavor it is the soul of a people realizing itself in spiritual freedom of action, the good of all being the law of each, each one's right corresponding to each one's duty. It is

political life interpreted in the light of Infinite Love, social justice administered according to human need, a fair chance and an open field in which the law of the jungle, the struggle for existence, shall give way to the Christ law of mutual help. It is the spiritual against the material, the ethical in man against the non-ethical in nature.

Whether on scientific grounds we agree with Herbert Spencer that it is not the duty of the state to educate, that education of the child should be provided by the parent, or with Thomas H. Green and Thomas Huxley that the state should enforce compulsory education, the fact remains that the need of Russia is Christian education. This, not primarily because Christianity must be preserved there, as elsewhere; nor because of the danger of an atheistic state infecting the countries of Central Europe and of the spread of atheism among Asiatics already tired of traditions and thread-bare beliefs, but for the sake of Russia itself, for without Christian education as a barrage against the materialistic atheism which has taken hold of the youth of Russia there can be for that country no future. Whether a nation shall have a future or not depends upon the moral character of the people. Equally so the continuance of a social

organism depends upon the moral health of the organism.

The mounds of Babylon, the ruins of Palmyra and Baalbec, the broken columns of the Roman Forum all utter louder than Sinai the same warning. No matter how intellectual a people may become, how far the reach of its arm, or the strength of its power, it seems to be an irresistible law that the nation which forgets God is wiped off the face of the earth. Scientific historians, studying only visible causes and effects, wars, invasions, decline of agriculture, shrinkage of currency, depopulation of cities, may see no spiritual forces at work, but if there is a God in history he is not present as an idle spectator of the drama.

Whether a state should educate its citizens or whether Russia at present is educating its youth in atheism is not the question here. It may not be the duty or province of the state to provide Christian education. The state has no divine authority, no commission nor scientific knowledge for such purpose. The Church alone has authority in the world of the Spirit. Through it alone, and not to the state, has the divine commission been given to "disciple all nations." Therefore it becomes a Christian duty of the churches, as far as it is possible

for them, to establish Christian education in Russia and thus enable that people, a people of potentiality equal to the most highly developed in literature, art, science and religion, to regain their strength which has been destroyed by the calamities of the World War and to prepare the nation for the democracy which is to come. Tyranny may rest upon bayonets, but democracy can be sustained only by intelligence.

Notwithstanding the misleading statements that defenders of the Soviet government make, illiteracy in Russia is deplorable. The Official Bulletin of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet government, January 10, 1923, shows that in Russia out of every 1,000 people 680 are unable to read or write. In Russia proper Mr. L. J. Lewery states in *Current History* that there were registered 27,500,000 totally illiterate persons above the age of eight. In the Ukraine there were 12,000,000. "Taking the entire able-bodied working population of Soviet Russia between the ages of 16 and 50 there were found 73 per cent of males and 36 per cent of females who can neither read nor write." These statistics were commented on by Premier Lenin in the Communist organ, the *Pravda,* January 4, 1923, from which Mr. Lewery quotes as fol-

lows: "While we go about blubbering about 'proletarian culture' as compared with the 'bourgeois culture' we are being handed a set of matter-of-fact figures which show that even in the matter of bourgeois culture our affairs are extremely bad. . . . There has been as yet but little done by us, infinitesimally little, toward shifting our entire state budget in the direction of satisfying, in the first line, the demands of primary schools."

If it should be said, as it is said by Bolshevistic apologists, that this condition is inherited, that the Soviets have reduced illiteracy, since their control of government, Lenin himself showed that this is not the case, but, on the contrary, the proportion of illiteracy per thousand was greater in 1920 under Soviet rule than in 1917 under the Tsarist government. Schools are closed in many districts, in others overcrowded; teachers are unpaid; children are demoralized and without moral instruction. Lunarcharsky himself, the head of the Commissary of Public Education, admitted in his Report, as published in the *Izvestia,* December 26, 1923, that the educational system had collapsed.

By insisting on Christian education as the most effective help that can be rendered Russia, not, of course, excluding material

assistance, because education is the crying need of its ignorant millions, is not meant the establishment of Christian churches. If as the result of education apart from sectarian propaganda such should develop out of the demands of the people, a visible expression of the racial, or national spirit, the real soul of the people, such churches will be a growth from within, not an imposition from without. This would insure their permanency.

Every race of people is distinct from every other race. If a people would emerge out of primal conditions it can reach its true destiny only by developing according to primal type. All true development depends upon conformity to type. One race cannot blend with another race and remain itself. To impose the gospel as it is felt in the soul of the Chinaman and interpreted by him, upon the soul of the East Indian, a Frenchman or an American as the kind of gospel he should have and no other, is a false conception of Christian education, a crude understanding of the Christian religion. God is everybody's God, and Christ is everybody's Christ, but the interpretation of God, of Christ, is different, and must be intimately felt to be different, in the soul of the Hindu and in the thought and feeling of the African, or the Italian, or the English-

man. Christ is the universal Christ. But he belongs to every race so like is he to each race, and every race understands him in its own racial way. Hence every race should manifest the gospel according to its peculiar racial characteristics and should thus make its own contribution to the universal adaptation of the gospel. What the Christ of India or of China will be to the ages to come, what the Christ of Russia will be, will depend upon the kind of Christ that grows out of the race consciousness, and that will depend largely upon the Christ that is presented, a sectarian Christ or the universal Christ of the Gospels.

Churches, therefore, should not look upon Russia as a happy hunting ground for their denominational or credal specialty. Sectarian creeds are no novelty in Russia. But the gospel of Christ, void of traditions and inherited interpretations, built into life and character, would be the most helpful assistance that the Protestant churches could give both to the reforming of the Church and to the evangelization of the millions who are outside that Church. Christian schools and the Christian press will make the old Russia and the Russia that has not yet found itself, a new Russia with a great future. The Russia of to-morrow is in the youth of to-day.

Methods will differ. But the method of approach to every problem goes a long way toward solving the problem. The definite end in view is the establishment of Christian schools and the diffusion of knowledge among the people. The marvelous record in Turkey of the American Board, which prior to 1870 was composed mainly of representatives of the Congregational and Presbyterian Churches, and especially since 1870 of the Presbyterian Mission in Asiatic Turkey, might well be studied, both as the type of schools needed in Russia and the method of disseminating Christian education among its various races.

The beginnings of the missionary work of that society back in 1820 were small, and the work was confined to personal conversation, translation of American textbooks, and distribution of Christian literature. But the results have been wonderful despite the antagonism of Greek and Roman ecclesiastics, the fear of the possible death penalty on all converts from Mohammedanism, and the cowardly indifference of the United States diplomatic representatives who could have shown at least as much interest in the work of the American missionaries as the British did in the interests of their nationals. To-day, because of British protection, there are schools

and colleges, hospitals, churches, and thousands of evangelical Protestants in Turkey.

What has been accomplished in Turkey, in Syria, and Palestine can be done in Russia. Nothing should be attempted, however, with the definite purpose of supplanting the Orthodox Church. That is the Church of Russia. It is a Christian Church and holds essential truth. It will be of no benefit to religion to introduce religious conflicts, to create more sects and subdivisions of sects among a people already cursed with divers divisions, political and religious. To establish elementary schools, and higher schools as needed, which the Orthodox Church in its impoverished condition can neither establish nor maintain, and with the aid of a native press disseminate Christian literature among all classes, will do more by its direct and indirect influence to cleanse and reform the Orthodox Church, and thereby restore primitive Christianity, than all the sectarian rivalries that a narrow and essentially persecuting spirit can set up in opposition to the ancient Church of the people. The union of Christendom will never be promoted by denominational selfishness, nor is sectarian zeal for the propagation of denominational opinions sufficient justification for the evils that ensue. Cooperation, and

not competition, is the Christlike way to the largest success. And the Christian thinker who takes a planetary view of Christianity might well consider seriously in all its implications whether the weakening of the historic churches will be more likely to strengthen faith in religion than to create universal skepticism.

As to Russia itself it is easy to speculate. Despite the designs, strategies, and dreamings of statesmen, there seems to be some controlling Power which stands outside world-movements and independent of all the plans and purposes of man controls and directs them according to its Will. What grandiose schemes of imperial expansion the great powers of Europe mapped out, each for itself, at the opening of the twentieth century! and what lofty philosophical theories, and political ambitions were shattered by the guns on the Marne! How agreeable to the predatory instincts of stronger races, how conformable to the rapacious policies of European military powers, to be informed that their contemplated crimes against weaker races were in perfect accord with the laws of nature!

Such were the political speculations of the German historians Treitschke, Mommsen, Sybel, and all others of their school who idol-

ized force as the civilizer, as the agent of the Almighty, for lifting backward people out of barbarism, and accelerating the progress of civilization. "It is an inexorable law of progress," writes one who would clothe his speculations in scientific phrase in order to hide their naked poverty, "that inferior races are made for the purpose of serving the superior; and if they refuse, they are fatally condemned to disappear."

But what is Progress, and what, precisely, are its "inexorable laws," which we assume to know so much about that we can confidently dogmatize concerning inferior races? While we may have the idea or think we have, and employ the word, do we really know what Progress is without knowing the goal? If we should argue that the goal is "universal happiness" or perfectibility on earth, how do we know that we are on the right road, that we are going in the right direction? What political theories, what social philosophies from Jeremy Bentham, Comte, J. S. Mill to Herbert Spencer with his *Social Statics,* appeal to our judgment only to be refuted by other theories evolved at a late date from clashing interests in a changing world? Many think modern civilization based upon capitalism is on the wrong road, that after thou-

sands of years of traveling we are all lost in the woods and in dire need of some leader to blaze a way out. Lenin and his Communists imagined that they had found the true path, only to plunge into the abyss.

A changing world is not governed by our philosophies. Von Treitschke and other German historians who believed in Force could easily discover "inexorable laws" which gave the race to the swift and the battle to the strong. They could prove from the working of jungle laws that inferior races are foreordained to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for the stronger. It was not difficult for them to discover by the aid of these "inexorable laws" a compelling reason for further expansion of German dominion not only in Europe but also in Asia Minor and the Far East. Such speculations were plausible; they inflated national egotism and inspired warlike overlords to prove them true by setting fire to the world.

In view of the "Rising Tide of Color" the revolt against civilization, the unrest of "inferior races," in India, China, Japan, and the dictatorial demands of the victorious Turk, philosophical interpretations of social laws based on a materialistic conception of human history are about as valuable as the pipe-

dreamings of a summer's day, or the energy of a child blowing bubbles.

It is just as easy to speculate on the future of Russia. If we should take some point in the nineteenth century when Russia had reached heights of power, and reflecting on the majesty of the empire, its military strength, its wealth, its designs of expansion in the Orient, its absorption of Manchuria—if one speculating on the future of such a nation that believed itself to be the lineal successor to the Byzantine Empire and looked to the day when Constantinople should be center of the Holy Orthodox Church of Russia, as Rome is of universal Catholicism, would our speculators on "inexorable laws" and the fate of empires imagine that the vultures of decaying empires were then on their way to devour the carcass of that mighty Colossus of the North? Russia had three objectives—Constantinople, Afghanistan, and China. She gained none, but was herself dismembered, losing Esthonia, Latvia, Poland, and the Ukraine. Jewish conspirators luxuriate in the palaces of her emperors, her nobles beg for bread, her people are in the depth of misery, and the Church that was to spread its spiritual dominion over half the world is the sport of infidels in the streets of Moscow.

The future is in the hands of God. One who believes in God's good will toward the inhabitants of the earth and that all things work together for good has solid ground for his faith. This is a moral universe. It is inconceivable, therefore, that evil should obtain ultimate victory over good. But the purposes of God may have unmeasured ages for their realization. It may be that Russia has not yet emptied her cup of woe. The final chapters of the French Revolution may yet be reenacted as a fitting close to the Russian. Robespierre may again denounce Danton and an uprising of the people, an insurrection of political decency and social justice may yet send Robespierre and his faction to keep him company. But whatever view we take, optimistic or pessimistic, it does not seem possible in an age like this, an age of enlightenment, of science, of world-wide commerce which link the nations in mutual dependence, an age of intellectual freedom, and democratic institutions, an age seeking the highest culture in every field of human endeavor, that an oligarchic monstrosity exhibiting all the characteristics of an Oriental despotism and at war with every principle of modern civilization, can continue to rule Russia.

At present Bolshevism is becoming respec-

table and autocracy is losing caste. Refugee princes wait on tables and are receptive of tips. Aristocratic houses are open to "paying guests" and lordly manors are sold at auction. What has happened to individuals has become the fate of governments. Lack of employment, of bread for hungry millions has forced proud governments to recognize relationships they would scorn to consider under other circumstances. Who would dream of Angora dictating to Downing Street? England, Italy, Germany and a few others, for such reasons, have recognized *de jure* the Soviet government. This indorsement in which trade "helps the hurt that honor feels" gives a degree of prestige to the Soviets among the Russian people, but of what benefit will recognition be if those governments must furnish the money to put Russia to work? The supposition that Russia will immediately export inexhaustible supplies of raw material to the factories of Europe is another of those fond delusions for the adoption of which so many European statesmen of the twentieth century are justly celebrated. Propaganda has the gift of invention, and what is lacking for present deception may be easily manufactured to supply the need. But the authoritative statement as to Russian resources in the

letter to Mr. Gompers by Secretary of State Hughes, April 18, 1921, in *The Balance Sheet of Sovietism,* by Boris Brasnol; in *The Greatest Failure in All History,* by John Spargo; in the Report of the Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C., June 12, 1922, may suggest sufficient reasons why with all the efforts of partisans to demonstrate the economic resurgence of Russia under Bolshevik rule, investment of capital from those countries having trade treaties with Russia is woefully lacking.

But Russia will live. The energies, intellectual and spiritual, resident in the soul of the Russian people cannot be suppressed. Delivered from Bolshevism, it is more than probable that Russia will yet play as important a rôle as France, England, or Germany in the history of Europe and the destiny of the world.

The Church will live. The collapse of the Church of Russia or the crumbling of its influence would be a direful calamity not only to Russia but to universal Christianity. Such a downfall would mean a further narrowing of Christian boundaries in the East, and, as one of the results of French and English jealousies and rivalries in Asia Minor, the certain advance of Mohammedanism. The revival

of Mohamedanism among its millions in Turkey, India, the Straits Settlements, North Africa, Persia, and Afghanistan is a challenge to Christianity. The leaders of Islam have no such fear of European powers as they once had. The World War was a great teacher. They have learned how to divide the councils of the so-called Christian powers. What Kemal Mustapha did on the shores of the Bosphorus, and Ismet Pasha accomplished at Lausanne, revealed to the Mohammedan races that unity of action against the divided interests of the nations of Europe will nullify their military superiority. A Gandhi boycott movement throughout India, Egypt, and Persia would shake the English Empire to its foundations. Russian propaganda has taken root in nearly all these countries, and the future of Christianity in those lands within easy reach of Southern and Eastern Russia would become extremely doubtful should a united Mohammedanism in a Holy War advance further into Europe.

The Eastern Orthodox Church is stagnant. Without political support it has become, through the triumph of Islam, a merely tolerated institution, subject to the arbitrary whims of the government at Angora. The value of treaties depends upon the military

strength supporting them; and in the present state of the world it will be only another evidence of political insanity to depend upon the trustworthiness of Turkish past masters in the refined art of political duplicity. The Russian Church reformed and invigorated could greatly strengthen the Eastern Church, and the concentrated energy of both could offer strong resistance to the inroads of Islam.

It would seem, therefore, if Christianity is to be preserved in the East, and if God calls through open doors and human needs, the imperative duty of American Christianity is to give financial support to the Church in Russia. The opportunity is now given without political intent to establish schools, to establish the printing press in various dialects for the diffusion of Christian literature according to the teachings of evangelical Christianity, and thus not only to save the Church of Russia from inertia and final decay, as once flourishing churches in Asia Minor decayed, but to enable her to become an evangelizing power in Persia, Afghanistan, and throughout the East.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allan, B. "Russia and Religion." *Nation* (London), April 21, 1923.

Antonelli. *Soviet Russia.*

Beilinson, M. "Two Internationals: Red and Black; Rapprochement Between the Church of Rome and the Soviet Government." *New Republic*, September 27, 1922.

Brailsford. *Russian Workers' Republic.*

Brasno, Boris. *The Balance Sheet of Sovietism.*

Chamberlin, W. H. "The Church and State in Russia." *Freeman*, August 29, 1923.

"Church in Soviet Russia." *American Review of Reviews*, November, 1921.

"Church in Soviet Russia." *Living Age*, February 7, 1920.

Claude, Anet. *Revolution Russe.*

Davis, J. "Religion in Soviet Russia." *Missionary Review of the World*, March, 1922.

"Religious Conditions in Soviet Russia." *Missionary Review of the World*, April, 1920.

Demidov, I. "Fight for Survival." *Living Age*, September 30, 1922.

Dukes, P. "Church in Bolshevik Russia." *New Europe*, March 18, 1920.

Fischer, L. "Soviet Russia's Grim Battle Against Religion." *Current History Magazine*, July, 1923.

Graham, S. "Where Is Holy Russia Now?" *London Quarterly Review*, October, 1920.

Hapgood, E. R. "Sermon, Soviet Style." *Independent*, April 23, 1921.

Hartman, L. C. "Religious Situation in Russia." *Missionary Review of the World*, August, 1923.

High, Stanley. "Why Wait to Save Russia?" *Christian Century*, November 29, 1923.

Holmes, J. H. "Religion in Revolutionary Russia." *Nation*, May 9, 1923.

"How Bolshevism Is Overwhelming the Russian Church." *Current Opinion*, June, 1923.

Lawton, L. "Religion of the Russian Revolution." *English Review*, June, 1918.

Loiseau, C. "Le Saint-Siege et la Revolution Russe." *Revue de Paris*, September, 1917.

Milliukoff. *Bolshevism an International Danger.*

Palmieri, A. "Holy See and the Soviet Government of Moscow. *Catholic World*, December, 1922.

Posener, S. "Les Persécutions Religieuses en Russie Sovietique." *Mercure de France*, May 15, 1923.

Pupoff, P. F. "Religious Revolution in Russia." *Current History Magazine*, April, 1920.

Raymond, E. T. "Russian Anti-Christ." *Outlook* (London), April 14, 1923.

"La Reconstitution de la Russie et le Problème Religieux." *Revue Politique et Littéraire*, November 5, 1921.

"Red Church in Russia." *Literary Digest*, October 14, 1922.

"Religious Aspects of Russian Reconstruction." *Living Age*, January 7, 1922.

"Religious Melée in Russia." *Literary Digest*, May 26, 1923.

Richards, G. W. "Church and Religion of Russia." *American Journal of Theology*, October, 1918.

Ross, Edward A. *The Russian Soviet Republic.* New York and London, The Century Company (1923).

Ruhl, A. "Bolshevik Drive on the Church." *Nation*, April 11, 1923.

"Russia's Church Controversy." *Living Age*, January 13, 1923.

"Soviet Russia and Religion." *Missionary Review of the World*, November, 1923.

Spargo. *The Greatest Failure in All History.*

Tregubov, L. "Church Revolution in Soviet Russia." *Living Age*, September 2, 1922.

Troubetzkoy, E. "Bolshevist Utopia and the Religious Movement in Russia." *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1920.

"Russia's Religious Renaissance." *Living Age*, April 17, 1920.

Urch, R. O. G. "Bolshevism and Religion in Russia." *Atlantic Monthly*, March, 1923.

Wallace. *Russia* (enlarged edition).

Whittemore, T. "Rebirth of Religion in Russia: The Church Reorganized While Bolshevik Cannon Spread Destruction in the Nation's Holy of Holies." *National Geographic Magazine*, November, 1918.

INDEX

A

Abdication Nicholas II, 53
Academy, Socialistic, 11
Address of Mott, 62
Agathangelos, 160, 170, 226
Alexander I attempts reform, 42
Alexander Kerensky, member of Provisional Government, 54
Alexius, Tsar curbs power of Church, 34; opposes Nikon, 35
American Boards, 292
American Relief Association, 137, 140
Amnesty of Exiles, 55
Antoinette, Queen, death of, 42
Antonine, Bishop, opposed to reforms, 202; described 202; defends veneration of relics, 182; deprived of office, 237
Archbishop Andronik, buried alive, 136
Archbishop Benjamin, death of, 151
Archbishop of Canterbury, 128
Archbishop Vassali, fate of, 136
Archbishop of Omsk, letter of, 128
Argument of Caiaphas, An, 134
Arnold, Matthew, 49
Assembly, Constituent, dissolved, 60
Assembly, National, of Church, 34; work of, 62
Atheism, 146, 272
Atheist, publication, 182
Atheists not all bad, 145
Athens, columns taken, 24
Attack upon the Church, 60, 84
Autocracy, Collapse of, 53

B

Bakunin, Michael, 42
Baptism of Russians, 25
Bax on Marriage, 92
Bebel on marriage, 91
Bishops at Detroit Council, 179
Bolshevik government, 97
Bolsheviks, defenders of, 14, 87, 109, 131; parlor-Bolsheviks, 131
Brasnol, Boris, quoted, 101
Brest-Litovsk treaty, 138, 139
Bucharin on expense of propaganda, 149
Bukekevitch, Appeals in behalf of, 213; death of, 217
Bullard, Arthur, testimony of, 114

C

Carlyle, quoted, 83
Catherine II, reign of, 41
Cepliak, Bishop, arrest of, 212
Church of Russia, origin of, 19, 26; character of, 17, 18, 48, 49, 50; calamity of, 17; State institution, 26, 28; relation to Constantinople, 30; head of,

45; wealth of, 38, 69; Sale of treasures of, 140, 145; clergy, conditions of, 50, 196; unchangeable in doctrine, 276, 277; future of, 244, 275, 279; clergy, condition of, 50, 119, 196
Communism not Christian, 18, 243
Communist party, number of, 142; control government, 198, 199
Comte, 44
Conclave, Orthodox, 60, 168
Congressional Record, quoted, 13
Constant, 44
Constantinople, capital, 22, 23; visited by Russian queen, 22; Russian ambassadors, 24; sends missionaries to Russia, 26; greet Church of, 24, 25
Constituent Assembly, 56
Contemporary Review, quoted, 11
Council, American-Russian, 169; declaration of, 169-174
Council, Living Church, 182; composition of, 165; introduces new doctrine, 191; resolutions, 186; sends report to Lenin, 190; condemned by American Council, 169
Courtier-Forster, in London Times, 104, 135
Convention, General, of Orthodox Russian Church in America, 179; Resolutions adopted, 179

D

Darwin, 44
Death ship, 101
Decrees, Soviet, 71, 100
Deism in England, fruit of, 140
Defense of Bolshevism, 124
Democracy, 285
Diderot, 44
Divorce, 89

E

Eastern Orthodox Church, 301
Education, 11, 76, 79, 81, 286
Effects of Skepticism, 44
Elections, Conclave, 164
Eudokim, speech of, 282
Executions, 9, 109

F

Famine, 124, 137
Federal Council, 215
Feuerbach, 44
Fourier, 44
Free speech, 255
Freedom, Religious, 197
French Revolution, effect of, 42
French Revolution of 1848 and government ownership, 252
Froude, 131
Future of Russia, Church, 267

G

General Council of 1923, 156
General Convention, Russian-American, 179
Gibbon, Historian, 131
Gompers, Samuel, Letter to, on Russia, 259
Goudonoff, Acts of, 30-32
Government, Soviet, presence of, 254, 255; recognition of, 258; dual character of, 179
Greek Church, converts Russia, 26

H

Hegel, 44
Helena, Queen, 22
Herzen, Alexander, 42
Hume, 44
Huxley, T. H., 146

I

Illiteracy, Russian, 258
Incas, communists, 288
Ivan the Terrible, 27

J

James II, 29
Jeremiah, Patriarch, 31
Jeremiah, prophet, 153
Jewish Bolshevik leaders, 106
Job elected first Patriarch, 31

K

Kant, 44
Kedrovsky named Bishop, 178; authority repudiated, 179; notice of, 209
Kerensky, 53, 59
Khomiakoff, 270
Korsheloff, 42
Krassnitsky, 203, 248

L

Lasalle, 44
Latsis Commission on Cheka, 113, 114
Leaders of Nonconformity, 154
Lecky, historian, on sale of Church treasures, 147
Lenin, 55, 57, 113, 116, 191, 254
Lenin, Madame, 76ff
Living Church, origin of, 159, 225, 226; Conclave of, 15; leaders place "cells," 119, 200; Condemned by Russian-American Council, 169, 178; Professor Sorokin on, 247; Congress of, 208; elections to General Council, 165; Reform acts, 182; condemns Patriarch, 188; commits Church to Communism, 187, 189, 191; reaches out to America, 176; exposure of, 224, 247; conclusions relative to, 265
Lunacharsky, Report on Education, 289

M

Marriage laws, 87
Martineau, Harriet, 146
Marx, Karl, 44, 191; theory abandoned, 99; theory as practiced in Peru, 251
Mill, J. S., 44
Ministers deprived of vote, 74
Morley, John, 146
Mott, J. R., addresses conclave, 62

N

Nihilism, 43
Nikhon, Patriarch, 35; condemned by Council, 36

O

Odessa, terror in, 104, 135
Omsk, Archbishop of, on Persecution, 128
Opinions on relevant subjects, 245
Opposition of Bishops to Moscow Council, 178
Orthodox Church and other Churches, 277; unchangeable in doctrine, 240

P

Pascal, 123

Patriarchate established, 32; abolished, 38; reestablished, 53; abolished by Living Church, 56
Persecution, 13, 130, 135, 218
Peter the Great, 37; changes Church government, 38
Pobiedonozstoff, procurator, 45
Political necessity, 134
Progress, idea of, 295
Provisional government, 53, 56
Proudhon, 44

Q

Queen Helena baptized, 22

R

Recognition of Soviets, 257
Red Army, education of, 77
Religion combated, 75; "opiate," 93
Religious Russians, 269
Reasons for Detroit Convention, 179
Report of Judiciary Committee, 256
Revolution, Causes of, 44
Russia, future of, 297
Russian doctrine unchangeable, 240, 276

S

Saint Simon, 44
Schwartz, testimony of, 174
Seizure of Church government, 159; church treasures, 140
Serfdom established, 30
Separation of Church and state, 70, 73
Shelley, poet, 268
Sobor, Great, 60; work of, 62
Sorokin, Professor, on Living Church, 247
Soviet Church, division in, 208
Soviet government dual, 198
Soviet leaders, character of, 142
Spencer, Herbert, on Communism in Peru, 288
Stepanoff, Editor of "Atheist," 81
Strauss, D. F., 44
Stürmer, 44
Synod, Holy, 45

T

Terror, reign of, 100, 125, 123, 126
Tikhon, elected Metropolitan, 64; Tikhon elected Patriarch, 66; appeals for famine sufferers, 137; denounces Bolsheviks, 139, 147; authority of, 170; guilt of, 155; condemned by Living Church, 188; trial postponed, 218; illness of, 219; confession of, 221; released, 223; proclamation of, 225; statement on resistance, 231; not opposed to reform, 242
Troeltsch, 154
Trotsky, Leon, 145, 269

U

Ukraine Church, 184
Ukraine illiteracy, 288
United States, protest of, 215
Utopia in France, 253

V

Vedensky, demands death

penalty, 218; indorses Lenin, 185; opinion of Marxism, 185; reports to Council, 186; submits to Soviets, 200; leader in Soviet Church, 201; seeks authority from Tikhon, 226

W

Wealth of Russian Church, 39, 69

Writers influencing Russian thought, 42, 44

Z

Zinoviev, communist, 197

Date Due

2/4 JAN 2 1 1971			
MAR 1 4 1973			

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

BR
936
.C773

54155

Cooke, R. J.
Religion in Russia.

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
1-7-71	John Solano	
FEB 28 '73		